



University
of Glasgow

Jezierski, Rachael A. (2011) *The Glasgow Emancipation Society and the American Anti-Slavery Movement*. PhD thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/2641/>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

The Glasgow Emancipation Society and the American Anti-Slavery Movement

Rachael A. Jezierski, MA (Hons-1st Degree)

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirement for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of History
College of Arts
University of Glasgow

October 2010

© Rachael A. Jezierski 2010

Abstract

This study reinterprets the history of the Glasgow Emancipation Society and its relationship to the American Anti-Slavery movement in the nineteenth century. It examines the role of economics, religion and reform, from Colonial times up to the US Civil War, in order to determine its influence on abolition locally and nationally. This thesis emphasizes the reformist tendencies of the Glasgow abolitionists and how this dynamic significantly influenced their adherence to the original American Anti-Slavery Society and William Lloyd Garrison. It questions the infallibility of the evangelical response to anti-slavery in Scotland, demonstrating how Scottish-American ecclesiastical ties, and the preservation of Protestant unity, often conflicted with abolitionist efforts in Glasgow. It also focuses on the true leaders of GES, persons often ignored in historical accounts concerning Scottish anti-slavery, which explains the motivation and rationale behind the society's zealous attitude and proactive policies. It argues that similar social, political and religious imperatives that affected the American movement likewise mirrored events in Scotland influencing Glaswegian anti-slavery. Lastly, it resurrects the legacy of the Glasgow Emancipation Society from its provincial role, showing it was, in fact, a leader in the British campaign against American slavery.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	4
Abbreviations	5-6
Introduction	7-15
Chapter I: The Beginning—Glasgow Emancipation Society’s formation, attitude and influences	16-34
Chapter II: The Scottish-American connection	35-67
Chapter III: Restraint, Reflection and Reaction	68-108
Chapter IV: “By uniting we stand, by dividing we fall”	109-152
Chapter V: Church and State Disunion: “No Union with Slaveholders, nor fellowship with pro-slavery minister or churches”	153-192
Conclusion	193-196
Bibliography	197-220

Acknowledgements

In the first instance, I must thank Colin C. Kidd and Edward J. Cowan. My supervisors consistently offered constructive advice and sound counsel throughout the years. Their mode of teaching and supervision is exceptional, and I feel privileged to work with such great scholars. Both are a credit to their professions and I hope our paths will cross again in the future.

I wish to thank the University of Glasgow Arts Faculty and College of Humanities for funding my doctorate, as well as the Carnegie Trust and Royal History Society for their generous grants.

The staff at the Mitchell Library Special Collections department, in particular, deserves special notice. Over the years, I have spent numerous hours researching the William Smeal Collection and, as always, the staff was incredibly helpful and diligent. Similarly, the National Archives of Scotland and the National Library of Scotland's personnel were welcoming and professional. It was a pleasure to do research in all three facilities and, I believe, it is their common commitment to service that sets them apart.

I would also like to acknowledge several fellow University of Glasgow graduate students and staff: Marc Alexander, Esme Binoth, Kimm Curran, Sarah Erskine, Nathan Gray, Paul Jenkins, Kathleen Johnston, Iain MacDonald, Dorothy Mallon, Janet McDonald, Ralph McLean, Valerie Wallace, and Melodee Beals Wood. Some have encouraged and supported me since my undergraduate days, and others have, in the final years, risen to the occasion, offering their help when I needed them most, and for that I am very grateful.

On a personal note, I want to thank my good friends, Jo Brown, Jody Dahle and Anne Hogan for always being there for me. I am grateful to have such wonderful people in my life. My parents, likewise, championed my various endeavors throughout the years. I know this particular achievement is special to them and I hope I have made them proud.

And, finally, I want to thank my beautiful daughter, Samantha, who was born during my studies, for her overwhelming love and patience. You are my greatest inspiration.

List of Abbreviations

AASRP	<i>American Anti-Slavery Reporter</i>
AASS	American Anti-Slavery Society
ABCFM	American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions
ACLA	Anti-Corn Law League (Glasgow)
ACS	American Colonization Society
AFASS	American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society
AJ	<i>Aberdeen Journal</i>
APS	Aborigines Protection Society
AR	<i>African Repository</i>
ASR	British <i>Anti-Slavery Reporter</i> (LASS)
ASSR	<i>American Anti-Slavery Record</i> (AASS)
BAA	Taylor, Clare, <i>British and American Abolitionists</i> (Edinburgh, 1974)
BCLASS	Bristol and Clifton Ladies Anti-Slavery Society
BF	<i>British Friend</i>
BFASS	British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society
BFASR	<i>British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter</i>
BFSUA	British and Foreign Society for Universal Abolition of Negro Slavery and the Slave Trade
BIS	British India Society
BoFASS	Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society
CoS	Church of Scotland
CM	<i>Caledonian Mercury</i>
CUS	Congregational Union of Scotland
DC	<i>Dundee Courier</i>
DSCHT	<i>Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology</i> , ed., Nigel M. de S. Cameron (Edinburgh, 1993)
EC	<i>Eclectic Review</i>
ENASS	Edinburgh New Anti-Slavery Society
ER	<i>Edinburgh Review</i>
EES	Edinburgh Emancipation Society
EU	Evangelical Union
FCS	Free Church of Scotland

GA	<i>Glasgow Argus</i>
GASS	Glasgow Anti-Slavery Society (original)
GC	<i>Glasgow Chronicle</i>
GES	Glasgow Emancipation Society
GFASS	Glasgow Female Anti-Slavery Society
GESMB	<i>Glasgow Emancipation Society Minutes Books</i> , William Smeal Collection, Mitchell Library
GFNA	Glasgow Female New Anti-Slavery Association
GH	<i>Glasgow Herald</i>
GM	<i>Gentleman's Magazine</i>
GNASS	Glasgow New Anti-Slavery Society
GPRA	Glasgow Parliamentary Reform Association
GPU	Glasgow Political Union
GRA	Glasgow Reform Association
GUSA	Glasgow Universal Suffrage Association
HASS	Hibernian Anti-Slavery Society
ODNB	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i> www.oxforddnb.com
MASS	Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society
MR	<i>Monthly Repository</i>
NAR	North America Review
NEASS	New England Anti-Slavery Society
QASM	<i>American Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine</i>
QR	<i>Quarterly Review</i>
RC	Relief Church
RG	<i>Reformers' Gazette</i>
SIA	<i>Slavery in America</i>
SHR	<i>Scottish Historical Review</i>
UPC	United Presbyterian Church
UPM	<i>United Presbyterian Magazine</i>
USC	United Secession Church
WLG	William Lloyd Garrison

Introduction

While canvassing local archives for sources pertinent to a survey of American-Scottish relations for the revolutionary era up until the Civil War, I consulted the William Smeal Collection at the Mitchell Library in order to gain some understanding of abolitionist feeling in Scotland, especially in regards to US slavery. What struck me was the glaring dichotomy between the industrialized wealth of Glasgow, knowingly founded on the proceeds of slave labour and produce, with the popular movement for universal emancipation. Why did Glaswegians, so reliant on the economic gains tied to various slave-related items—tobacco, sugar, and cotton, especially, not to mention their close commercial and familial links with American slave plantations, the British Empire and other parts of the world, en masse, oppose it?

Perusal of the Glasgow Emancipation Society papers yielded more questions than answers. First and foremost, I was surprised by the lack of agreement amongst professed evangelicals in relation to the status of African slaves as humans, as well as some vacillation with regards to their rights as fellow men. This seemed at odds with what was generally considered an evangelically inspired movement, in terms of Scottish abolition, yet, had its own elements of indifference and dissention. The other, more potent issue to consider was the Glaswegian society's predilection with American democratic ideals, both religiously and politically, as well as its constant focus on the Declaration of Independence, especially in relation to the individual rights of men. Here obvious parallels could be drawn between Scottish reformist activity and the plight of the slaves, but, then, why has it been portrayed as just happenstance or secondary in importance to the religious impulses for anti-slavery in Scotland? This was only the beginning of my inquiry.

After further research and much consideration, I commit myself not only to answering such questions, as mentioned, but to exploring the psyche of the Glasgow Emancipation Society. In order to fully understand Glaswegian abolition for the nineteenth century, I felt it was imperative to understand the various mitigating factors surrounding Scottish anti-slavery and its preoccupation with US slavery through economics, religion and reform. The significant link between America and Scotland is not questioned, although, I feel, in the broader sense, it has always been implied rather than intricately dissected. I also believe there is a story to be told about the many contributing members of GES, not just the figureheads that feature prominently in historical accounts.

What drew me to the Glasgow Emancipation Society was their determined, uncompromising approach to abolition, which, like their American cohorts, placed them at odds with local and national government authorities, much of the aristocratic and mercantile elite, certain religious bodies, and, at times, their own colleagues and friends. The eagerness of the Glaswegian abolitionists to hold Americans accountable to their own Declaration of Independence, which declared that all men were created equal, while promoting concepts of liberty and the rights of man, struck a chord. Why would Scots, already invested in their own struggle for civil and political liberties, concern themselves about the plight of slaves in another country? There must have been some underlying link between the Scottish penchant for the American ideal and their own needs and wants for Scotland. GES's strict adherence to principle became the linchpin of their cause; convincing Americans to abolish slavery removed the ideological barriers to their own social and political enslavement. By appreciating the motives behind the rationale of the Glasgow society, I felt, in turn, I could better understand my own country's crusade against the system of slavery.

Objectives

My first objective is to explore the history of GES—who were its members; what social groups did they represent; what political or religious ideology did they espouse; in what ways did their individual circumstances affect their judgment in relation to their anti-slavery beliefs; and, lastly, what core values and principals brought them together? In doing this, I feel it is equally important to understand the underlying historical factors which influenced Glaswegian anti-slavery during the nineteenth century, mainly Scotland's significant ties to the slave trade and slavery, including its continued economic dependence on the manufacture of goods derived from slave products; the intimate and extended Scottish-American religious affiliations, the importance of revivals with regards to abolition, as well as the reciprocal affinity between the larger transatlantic Protestant community; and, finally, the impact of American and French revolutionary ideas on the reformist tendencies of GES, not only in respect of their own perception of democracy, liberty and the rights of man, but how it shaped their anti-slavery rationale. These elements continuously affected the progress and substance of abolition, especially in Glasgow, and, in turn, explain why gradual versus immediate emancipation was still debated in the 1830s and beyond.

Secondly, I want to deconstruct the evangelical argument as the main basis for Scottish abolitionism, which could also be challenged in the wider British and Atlantic world context. Anti-slavery historiography concerning Scots tends to rely on the evangelical model, in some respects ignoring apparent diverging attitudes and beliefs. This is not intended to disprove the significance of the evangelical response to slavery, but to clarify the minute differences that directly affected GES's methodology and overall goals. Some of the questions being examined: did the religious community in Glasgow, namely Protestant Dissenters, overwhelmingly support anti-slavery, and, if so, why did a sizable portion endorse the American Colonization Society, which advocated colonization and gradual liberation, while insisting on a program of civilization and Christianization prior to freedom; and, more importantly, why did ministerial cooperation with the Glasgow society decrease over the years, especially during the 1840s, when American and Scottish Protestants focused on preserving an Evangelical Alliance?

Thirdly, I believe the progressive and radical reforming tendency of several GES members is key to understanding their overall abolitionist ethos. The core committeemen were deeply involved in other sociopolitical reforms. In many ways, it explains the shift from a gradualist, apathetic approach to anti-slavery, as evident in the old Glasgow Anti-Slavery Society, to the more absolutist, uncompromising policy of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, which mirrored their adherence to the original American Anti-Slavery Society and William Lloyd Garrison. Furthermore, the real aims and aspirations of Scottish reformers, and, in particular, GES's link to political radicalism in Scotland will be investigated, as well as its relationship with the working-class movement.

By analysing the evangelical and reforming impulses, I aim to show how these factors directly affected GES's internal cooperation amongst its own membership, as well as the society's relationship with other American and British societies; primarily, its homogenous relations with the Hibernian Anti-Slavery Society, the London Agency Anti-Slavery Society, and AASS versus its, at times, conflicting association with the later American and British Foreign Anti-Slavery societies.

In the same vein, I challenge the "provincial" label applied to the Glasgow Emancipation Society. I hope to demonstrate that the society committed itself to a wider, more universal application of civil and religious liberties. They were not confined by their own prejudices and specific Scottish predilections, they were reacting to parallel sociopolitical concerns in the United States, a country with which they were markedly knowledgeable about and

intrinsically connected to, alongside other worldly matters dealing not only with human enslavement, but the wider application of humanitarian philanthropy.

The main objective of my dissertation is to defend my particular viewpoint on the Glasgow Emancipation Society, which I feel differs from previous historiography. By describing the development of anti-slavery activities and opinion in Scotland, especially nineteenth century abolition, while addressing and examining the various mitigating factors affecting the Glasgow society, I hope to inject constructive debate into this particular field of study. I want the reader to absorb a more intricate picture of GES, to appreciate the nuances of Glaswegian anti-slavery in relation to wider Scottish and transatlantic sociopolitical issues; to challenge sweeping generalizations often ascribed to abolition studies; and, finally, to encourage the continual reassessment of anti-slavery not only in Britain and America, but worldwide.

Source Material

A considerable amount of primary source information was used to compile this dissertation. Manuscript and archival materials, including the Glasgow Emancipation Society correspondence, minute books, annual reports and cashbooks, were sourced from the Brougham Papers, University College London; the Glasgow University Library, Special Collections; the Mitchell Library, William Smeal Collection; the National Archives, Kew; the National Archives of Scotland; and the National Library of Scotland. Anti-slavery related periodicals and society reports consulted include the Cowen Tracts, Newcastle University; the Hume Tracts, University College London; the Samuel J. May Anti-Slavery Collection, Cornell University; Recovered Histories, Anti-Slavery International; and the Wilson Anti-Slavery Collection, John Rylands University. Eighteenth and nineteenth century journals, newsprint and publications were sourced from the British Library Newspapers Database; the ECCO, Gale Centage; Google books; Internet Archive.org; and the Statistical Accounts of Scotland.

A significant portion of the memoirs and missives referred to were published accounts, in particular, those of William Anderson, James G. Birney, Frederick Douglass, Charles G. Finney, William Lloyd Garrison, Hugh Heugh, Elizabeth Heyrick, Peter Mackenzie, James and Lucretia Mott, Arthur and Lewis Tappan, James Turner, Ralph Wardlaw, and Henry Clark Wright. In total the publications of eight American and twenty-one British anti-slavery societies were consulted. Various other pamphlets and opinion were collected

from American and British religious, social and political entities. Parliamentary papers and state trial documents for Britain were obtained from the works of Henry Adams, William Cobbett, and Thomas C. Hansard, and American government papers were examined from the U.S. Department of State.

Previous Historiography

Not since the early 1980s has historical research focused on the Glasgow Emancipation Society. The first known scholar to tackle the subject, C. Duncan Rice, in 1969 wrote extensively on the Scottish contribution to American abolition, a large part of which dealt with GES, culminating in his book *The Scots Abolitionists*.¹ Robert L. Bingham presented an MLitt in 1973 focused entirely on GES. His piece compiled practical social and bibliographical information on individual members, lay and clergy, while also providing some variance in viewpoint from Rice.² Both authors' main works provided the groundwork for future GES study and continue to be used almost exclusively in anti-slavery sources referencing the Glasgow abolitionists. Another significant contribution is Robert Botsford's *Scotland and the American Civil War*, which shed some light on Scottish and American anti-slavery in the run up to disunion, although its focus dealt mostly with the Edinburgh societies, not GES.³ More recently, though, in time for the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the slave trade in Britain, Iain Whyte compiled another exposé on the Scottish dimension, covering 1756-1838.⁴

There exists a limited number of general anti-slavery studies which acknowledge Scottish contributions, especially that of the Glasgow group. Clare Taylor's *British and American Abolitionists* pays particular attention to GES due to its concentration on the relationship between William Lloyd Garrison and his British allies. Written in 1974, it highlights research by George Shepperson, other Scottish-American historians and careful examination of a select portion of Garrison's correspondence.⁵ Another source is the thesis by Douglas Riach written in 1976, although it concentrates on the Irish aspect, it inevitably provides further information on GES, due to the intimate relationship forged between the

¹ C. Duncan Rice, *The Scots Abolitionists* (Baton Rouge, 1981)

² Robert L. Bingham, *The Glasgow Emancipation Society* (MLitt, University of Glasgow, 1973)

³ Robert Botsford, *Scotland and the American Civil War* (PhD, University of Edinburgh, 1955), pp. 1-133

⁴ Iain Whyte, *Scotland and the Abolition of Black Slavery* (Edinburgh, 2006)

⁵ Clare Taylor, *British and American Abolitionists* (Edinburgh, 1974)

Scots, Irish and American Garrisonians.⁶ Betty Fladeland wrote two significant pieces in the 1980s, which highlighted Glasgow abolitionist links with Chartism and the working class.⁷ In 1985, the University of North Carolina published *The Black Abolitionist Papers—The British Isles*, volume one of a much larger series. The Glasgow Emancipation Society commands a noteworthy space within this text due to the high amount of Negro American abolitionists who frequented Scotland, lecturing throughout the country.⁸ Clare Midgely's study *Women against slavery* illustrates the important role Scottish women played in the success of GES and their Edinburgh counterparts.⁹

Thesis Outline

Chapter one provides background information on the circumstances surrounding the establishment of the Glasgow Emancipation Society. It discusses reasons why London abolitionists shied away from endorsing William Lloyd Garrison's appeal for British assistance. Likewise, it explains the role of the American Civilization Society in Britain and its affects on Scottish efforts to combat US slavery. The intricate network ties between GES members is examined, demonstrating the influence of various social, political and religious movements on Glaswegian abolitionism.

Chapter two looks to expand historical knowledge on the various economic, religious and reform aspects of Scottish, in particular Glaswegian, society that affected the progress of abolition throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Scotland's lengthy association with slavery and the slave trade, which directly affected the country's material advancement, will be discussed. Profits from tobacco and sugar, along with compensation money, were reinvested into other profitable Victorian enterprises, namely the manufacturing of American slave-grown cotton by-products. Anti-slavery in Glasgow, especially, struggled against the might of the mercantile and elite classes, who greatly profited from slave-related industries.

The intricate religious ties between Scots and Americans, dating back from colonial times to the 1800s, will be explained. It will show how, in the wake of emigration and

⁶ Douglas C. Riach, *Ireland and the Campaign against American Slavery* (PhD, University of Edinburgh, 1976)

⁷ Betty Fladeland, *Men & Brothers* (Urbana, 1972), ----. "'Our Cause being One and the Same': Abolitionists and Chartism," in *Slavery and British Slavery, 1776-1846*, ed. James Walvin (Baton Rouge, 1982), pp. 69-99

⁸ Peter C. Ripley, ed., *The Black Abolitionist Papers—the British Isles*, I (Chapel Hill, 1985)

⁹ Clare Midgley, *Women against Slavery* (London, 1992)

reoccurring revivals, theological philosophies were reciprocally exchanged between America and Scotland. Moreover, it was their common commitment to orthodox Calvinist church doctrine and polity that endeared Scottish churches of the nineteenth century with their US brethren; however, it was these same fraternal ties which affected anti-slavery loyalties in the run up to Civil War.

Lastly, there existed a strong connection between Scottish reform and American revolutionary ideology, which influenced Glaswegian abolition. Scots of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century drew powerful analogies between Scotland's own economic, political and social ills to that of Colonial America. Reformers were inspired by the emerging republic's freedom of religion, informal social order and universal representation. Some of Glasgow's most active reformers, radicals and moderates alike, were life-long members of GES. The society's rhetoric often alluded to American ideals, especially civil and religious liberty, as well as man's inalienable rights. They looked to the US for acknowledgement and inspiration with regards to their own social and political circumstances, in many ways equating their own struggle for rights with that of the slave.

Chapter three details the connection between Glaswegian civil and religious reform of the early 1830s with GES. It touches on the debate between gradual and immediate emancipation, showing how Scottish sociopolitical thinkers demanded speedy liberation for slaves alongside advocacy of their own rights. Dr. Andrew Thomson's plea for immediate emancipation, regardless of the consequences, split anti-slavery circles. The Glasgow Emancipation Society, imbued with a more progressive attitude, evidenced by its political reformers and Voluntaries, never wavered in their commitment to immediate liberation.

This chapter further discusses how the British anti-slavery community was not only split over the immediate versus gradual debate, but also on the propriety of campaigning against slavery worldwide, especially in the US. GES teamed up with the Edinburgh Emancipation Society, the Hibernian Anti-Slavery Society, and the London Agency Society, which split from the more-conservative LASS, to prioritize American slavery. The Glasgow abolitionists believed the eradication of American slavery would effectually end slavery throughout the world, while resuscitating the new republic's Christian and democratic image. In this respect, their aims mirrored that of the newly formed American Anti-Slavery Society.

Chapter four shows how GES was united in opposing Christian complicity in slavery and Texan independence, pre-empting other British anti-slavery societies, and was directly influenced by AASS policies. The society successfully campaigned against the Apprenticeship Scheme; however, certain disagreements began to divide the committee. Conservative members, led by Drs. Ralph Wardlaw and Hugh Heugh, who supported planter compensation, praised the colonial interest and government for terminating West Indian slavery. Rev. William Anderson and the more radical members of the society believed emancipation had only been achieved through popular support from the people.

Following Emancipation in 1838, there was a general lull in anti-slavery sentiment. GES espoused other slavery-related causes, like British India, to revive public interest in universal slavery. Despite this, the ever-present issue of Scottish church fellowship with American slaveholders persisted. This chapter will demonstrate how the AASS's spilt in 1839, allegedly over women's rights and other extraneous issues, was directly linked to William Lloyd Garrison's condemnation of Christian involvement in slavery and anti-abolitionist orthodox clergy. When the controversy reached Glasgow, it inevitably divided the society along ideological lines—the conservatives resigned rather than espoused Garrison's "No Fellowship" policy, while the more progressive members of the society remained loyal to the original AASS agenda.

Chapter five will discuss how GES's own policies, following the 1841 schism, became increasingly aggressive and militant. The Glasgow society headed two major campaigns during this period, attacking both the Free Church of Scotland, who solicited funds from US churches connected with slaveholding, and the Evangelical Alliance, which failed to exclude slaveholders as members. During this time, the Glasgow society joined forces with former antagonists, the AFASS and the BFASS, as well as some FCS ministers, in condemning Christian communion with American slaveholding churches. It argues that both campaigns were clearly not related to the old Voluntary controversy, but reflected the general consensus of Scottish popular opinion and exposed the hypocrisy of some British clergy, who chose to prioritize Anglo-American Protestant unity over the plight of the slave.

Divisions in Glaswegian anti-slavery persisted well into the 1850s, although GES attempted on several occasions to bridge the gap. The publication of Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* reinvigorated British abolition, providing a perfect opportunity for ex-GES members to reorganize as a new society that not only opposed the

ultraist leaning of the AASS, but also sought to debunk the old Glasgow society's prestige. This internecine conflict weakened Glaswegian abolition; nonetheless, this chapter contends that GES was more interested in supporting Stowe's book and the Penny Offering, which fostered public interest in US slavery, whereas the GNASS seemed preoccupied with destroying Garrison's credibility.

Conflict further deepened when GES adopted the old American society's "No Union" plan in response to various legislative enactments that supported slavery. It explains how the liberal ideals of GES were intricately invested in the eradication of US slavery; emancipating American slaves was crucial to the wider sociopolitical agendas of several committee members. In this respect, the battle fought in Columbia had a direct bearing on reformist efforts in Scotland. Lastly, it discusses how the Civil War divided abolitionist opinion. By 1863, against general public opinion, the old Glasgow society, led by its more radical reformist members, choose to support Lincoln and the cause of the Northern States. It argues that GES's shift from non-resistance to pro-Union was not strictly due to loyalty for Garrison, but coincided with resurgence in Glaswegian reformist activity.

The beginning—Glasgow Emancipation Society’s formation, attitude and influences

Chapter I

The people, battling for their own rights, had heart room to hear the prayer for the rights of others more deeply oppressed. Thus ever will liberty be expansive and expanding in the direction of human brotherhood.

James McCune Smith¹⁰

Prior to the official formation of GES, two circulars written by John Murray were distributed in Glasgow. Although distantly related to a leading mercantile family, Murray was neither rich nor prominent in society but was, for some time, a steadfast abolitionist.¹¹ Dated 5 December 1833, his first letter invited those “friendly to the slave” to form a society promoting “Universal Extinction of Slavery...particularly in the United States of America.” Both typeset and handwritten, the paper suggests Murray organised the meeting well before the date set.¹² The following day several laymen and clergy met at the Christian and Philanthropic Agency House of David Nasmith, a Congregationalist connected with several British and American religious and philanthropic societies.¹³ Nasmith travelled extensively through America promoting City Missions in 1830, having met abolitionists Arthur Tappan and Dr. Lyman Beecher. As “an advocate of human freedom,” he also sympathized with the plight of slaves.¹⁴

Murray drew inspiration from William Lloyd Garrison’s *An Appeal to the Friends of Negro Emancipation throughout Great Britain* concerning American slavery. Avoiding overtly religious rhetoric, the address nonetheless roused British sensitivities concerning morals and justice, decrying the destruction of families and the defilement of women—pillars of polite Victorian society:

There are husbands who have had to stand unresistingly, and see their wives scourged before there eyes!—*There* are wives whose husbands were but

¹⁰ James McCune Smith, "John Murray (of Glasgow) Dated 25 September 1852," in *Autographs for Freedom*, ed. Julia Griffiths and Rochester Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society (Boston, 1853), pp. 62-67. Smith, a black American student at Glasgow University, was a life-long member of GES.

¹¹ Smith, "Murray," pp. 62-63

¹² *GESMB*, p. 1 (including both circulars). The date, time and location were later added by hand, indicating the circular was pre-printed in anticipation of a future meeting.

¹³ Gordon Goodwin, "Nasmith, David (1799–1839)," rev. H. C. G. Matthew, *ODNB* (Oxford, 2004) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19794

¹⁴ John Campbell, *Memoirs of David Nasmith* (London, 1844), p. 21, 205-222.

yesterday driven off in chains to a far distant state!—*There* are parents whose children have been ruthlessly torn from their arms...brother and sisters, the former bewailing an eternal separation, the latter exposed to a fate worse than even death itself.¹⁵

Some historians have criticised Garrison for allegedly misunderstanding the British people and offending their sentimentalities.¹⁶ This letter proves quite the opposite—it is simple, endearing and straight to the point, while cleverly appealing to the masses by focusing on the importance of family; praising Britain’s struggle against colonial slavery; enjoining the religious community’s precedence on salvation; and, most important, warmly addressing the message to “Friends.”¹⁷ It is not by accident that Murray, having social connections to the London Agency Committee, would take an active interest in this area. He undoubtedly knew a thing or two about America’s role in slavery, not only through his experiences in the West Indies, but also through his English anti-slavery connections. In 1823 Zachary Macaulay and Thomas Cooper wrote *Negro slavery*, which exposed the connection between West Indian and Southern American slavery, therefore, a further implication of British complicity.¹⁸

Garrison’s appeal, through the New England Anti-Slavery Society, though, was drafted several months beforehand, and accompanied a request by the NEASS for George Thompson, lecturer for the London society, to be sponsored for a tour of the States.¹⁹ By 1 August 1833, the British were congratulating themselves for passing the Emancipation Act “by which a final termination has been put to slavery itself throughout all the colonial dependencies of the British empire.”²⁰ Originally sent to solicit funds for Coloured youth schools, Garrison, a representative of the NEASS, seized this golden opportunity. He greatly admired British abolitionists for their honesty and forthrightness, calling “a fig a fig, and a spade a spade,” and hoped to capitalize on this symbolic event—one, to encourage British abolitionists to openly support an immediatist stance on American

¹⁵ WLG, *An Appeal to the Friends of Negro Emancipation throughout Great Britain* (10 August 1833), reprinted in GES, *First Annual Report of the Glasgow Emancipation* (Glasgow, 1835), pp. 9-10

¹⁶ Botsford, *Scotland and the American Civil War*, pp. 18-17, Taylor, *BAA*, p. 6

¹⁷ WLG, *An Appeal to the Friends of Negro Emancipation*, pp. 9-10

¹⁸ Smith, “Murray”, p. 62. Zachary Macaulay and Thomas Cooper, *Negro slavery* (London, 1823). Murray worked alongside a Dr. Hamilton and an uncle of George Stephen, London Agency member, against slavery in St. Kitts. Stephen’s father, James Stephen, recalled his brother William’s anti-slavery efforts in the West Indies in his memoirs *The Memoirs of James Stephen* (London, 1854), pp. 41-42, 158, 172-173.

¹⁹ GES, *First Annual Report*, p. 10

²⁰ *SIA*, “Resolutions of Several Associated Bodies on the Subject of American Slavery,” 1 (July, 1836), pp. 20-21

slavery; and, two, to discredit the American Colonization Society.²¹ Garrison hoped to capture the moral and religious sentiment of British anti-slavery and direct it at the US public—more specifically Christian America. Influenced by Rev. George Bourne, he already knew about the connection between the American churches and Southern slavery. As a Presbyterian minister in Virginia, Bourne preached against the system and, consequently, was relieved of his post by the Lexington Presbytery. His pamphlet *The Book and Slavery Irreconcilable* was published in 1816 and later reprinted as a *Picture of slavery in the United States of America*.²² At the time of Garrison's visit, Scottish dissenting ministers and the British nonestablishment community at large were deeply involved in transatlantic correspondence with their American brethren over revivals and the Voluntary principle. Even in 1833, it makes sense that Garrison hoped to galvanize this element of society to tackle the pro-slavery sentiment of US churches, especially since he was already butting heads with clergy back home.

Evidence indicates that in 1833 Garrison was already being maligned by American clergy who despised the abolitionist charges against ministers for either directly, indirectly holding slaves or being the apologists for slavery—this included Northern clergy—many of whom had familial ties to slavery or owned slaves themselves. Information disseminated to British brethren discredited the American abolitionist as “a madman, an incendiary, a pestilent fellow, the fit companion of felons, the guilty inmate of a dungeon.” This same rhetoric was utilized to demonize the missionary William Knibb.²³

In some respects Garrison had made significant inroads in organizing British religious figures, both lay and ministerial, to publicly expose the hypocrisy of American spiritual bodies and members in relation to slavery. He succeeded in obtaining a "Protest" signed by Thomas Buxton, Cropper, Macaulay, George Stephen, and William Wilberforce—leading evangelical laymen in Britain's anti-slavery scene.²⁴ The letter undermined the supposedly Christian and philanthropic nature of the ACS, a group that, according to American

²¹ Garrison to Samuel J. May (4 December 1832), Garrison to Miss Harriet Minot (19 March 1833), in Taylor, *BAA*, pp. 20-23, GES, *First Annual Report*, pp. 9-12. The quote “a fig a fig, and a spade a spade” was well known in the Protestant community as the famous words of Rev. John Knox of the Scottish Reformation.

²² George Bourne, *The Book and Slavery Irreconcilable* (Philadelphia, 1816),-----, *Picture of slavery in the United States of America* (Middletown, 1834), Fladeland, *Men and Brothers*, pp. 182-83

²³ EES, *A Voice to the United States of America* (Edinburgh, 1836), 48-51, Hinton, *Memoir of William Knibb*, Second edition (London, 1849), pp. 158-160

²⁴ *Abolitionist* (US), “British Protest Against the American Colonization Society,” 1:10 (October 1833), pp. 157-158, *SIA*, “Brief Notices of the Progress of Abolition,” 1 (July, 1836), p. 5, GES, *First Annual Report*, pp. 11-12

abolitionists, aimed at deporting Coloured American citizens while maintaining prejudicial attitudes both in writings and actions. Garrison found in Thompson a kindred spirit who equally despised the Christian link to slavery. While in America, Thompson's reports highlighted the problem, giving credence as an eyewitness to American abolitionist concerns, but also proved useful in rounding up Christian sympathizers to the anti-slavery movement. Before leaving Britain, Thompson stated he intended the "overthrow of a system which disgraces alike the Christian and Republican Institutions of America."²⁵

Meanwhile arrangements by Garrison to hold a public meeting in conjunction with the English society advocating direct action against American slavery fell apart. The older London members urged caution knowing full well the implications of British opinion on US political discourse, deciding a formal denunciation of ACS was more appropriate than offending Americans by holding a meeting specifically for the abolition of slavery.²⁶ George Ramsay (later Earl of Dalhousie), an avid reader of American themed books, noted that Americans "complain loudly and bitterly of the abuse of their society by English travelers and tourists."²⁷ The British took great pleasure in attacking American democracy, often comparing their society, culture and institutions. Many of these views were aired in the years following wars with Great Britain, yet some prevailed well into the nineteenth century. A degree of Scottish private letters concerning America reiterated this stance. One, in particular, called the Republic a "Licentious Country...all are Deists."²⁸ A young Thomas Carlyle sneeringly claimed, "Yankees are long-headed personages."²⁹ Isaac Weld attacked US politics in his *Travels through the states of North America*, railing against the "Republican, and disgusting character of Americans."³⁰ Popular journals, such as the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly Review* belittled American intellectual productivity and US vanity.³¹ An Englishwoman, Frances Trollope, chided Americans for "they inveigh against the governments of Europe; because, as they say, they favour the powerful and oppress the weak...you will see them with one hand hoisting the cap of liberty, and with

²⁵ *GESMB*, pp. 46-48, George Thompson letter to GES (6 August 1834), pp. 74-81 (18 January-1 March 1836), GES, *First Annual Report*, pp. 34-35, EES, *Voice to the United States of America*.

²⁶ James Cropper to Garrison (5 July 1833), in Taylor, *BAA*, p. 24

²⁷ George Ramsay, *Notes*, 142-143, Dalhousie Muniments (GD45/3/657), NAS

²⁸ Alexander Mackrae, *Letters to James Grant, Esquire, Commissary Clerk, Inverness*, 15 and 22 February 1805, Bught Muniments (GD.23/6/410), NAS

²⁹ Thomas Carlyle, *Letters to Robert Mitchell*, 24 May 1815, no. 6, (Misc Docs/Deposits-GD.1/714/1-17), NAS

³⁰ Isaac Weld, *Travels through the states of North America*, vol. I, (London, 1799), p. 114

³¹ *ER*, "The Complete Works, in Philosophy, Politics, and Morals, of the late Dr. Benjamin Franklin", 8:16 (July, 1806), p. 327, *QR* quoted in John Bristed, *The resources of the United States of America* (New York, 1818), Sec. 47

the other flogging their slaves.”³² Macaulay questioned Britain's own indifference, though, stating, “Is it less the duty of every Englishman than of ‘every American, who loves his country, to dedicate his whole life, and every faculty of his soul, to efface this foul stain from its character?’”³³

During 1833 powerful figures in the British anti-slavery scene promoted other means for alleviating slavery in the United States. ACS representative, Elliott Cresson, who advocated gradual emancipation and the relocation of free blacks to Liberia, held strong ties in England, initially garnering the backing of Thomas Clarkson, Wilberforce and sponsorship from Augustus Fredrick, the Duke of Sussex. The ACS’s correspondence between the two countries was empathetic and unpretentious, emphasizing their mutual “philanthropic” and “Christian” anti-slavery policies.³⁴ Between January and July, the ACS successfully gained several Scottish adherents, including some later prominent GES committee members. The *African Repository* reported that defunct Scottish anti-slavery societies were regrouping to assist the society’s agenda, the “most likely means to civilize and Christianize the natives of Africa.” Aberdeen, Dumfries, Dundee, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Greenock and Perth organized meetings and arranged committees to solicit donations.³⁵

ACS’s conservative outlook on slavery appealed to the upper classes—middle class, merchants, professionals and aristocrats—purely gradualist in thought, evangelical in deed and prejudicial in nature, who firmly upheld social order theories. Former members of the Edinburgh Abolition Society, prior to the EES, who rejected Andrew Thomson’s call for immediate abolition, joined the ACS: Lord Monteith, Lord Advocate Francis Jeffrey and other leading clergy and men of influence. ACS meetings held in Scotland frequently emphasized “Christian intercourse” between the US and Britain, especially the evangelical focus on missionary work in Africa. British benevolent societies often supported efforts to civilize and Christianize “heathens”—not just slaves, but also the unchurched poor in Britain. Correspondence from ACS affiliates inevitably mentioned certain prejudicial comments towards people of colour in general. Scottish papers, reflecting a significant degree of interest from the public, often reported the society’s activities. In Glasgow, as in

³² Frances Trollope, *Domestic Manners of the Americans* (London, 1832), pp. 221-22. This reference taken from a reprint, ed. Donald Smalley (New York, 1949).

³³ Macaulay and Cooper, *Negro Slavery*, pp. 34-7.

³⁴ *AR*, “British and Foreign Society for the Abolition of Slavery,” 10 (December, 1834), pp. 304-307, *Colonizationist*, “Great Meeting in Philadelphia,” (January, 1834), pp. 288-289, “American Colonization Society,” (February, 1834), pp. 293-296

³⁵ *AR*, “Letter of ACS agent Elliot Cresson,” (March, 1834), pp. 18-22

other major Scottish towns, a Ladies' Colonization Committee formed with Lady Carnegie as Patroness, while the men's committee attracted Rev. William Kidston (later GES), Andrew Mitchell and Principle Macfarlane.³⁶ Historians have paid little attention to the ACS in Scotland. The society's Scottish support showed some degree of class divide within the anti-slavery ranks. Those who supported ACS were mainly upper-class evangelicals with strong representation from conservative ministers, whereas later emancipation societies consisted of liberal middle class members and clergymen.

Garrison's triumphant acquisition of the "Protest" significantly damaged ACS's reputation in Britain. Despite its lauded importance, the Agency, at that time, was reluctant to concede any further support. According English Quaker James Cropper, Zachary Macaulay "thought we might justly give offence in America if we were to hold a meeting where the assured & leading object was the Abolition of slavery in the United States and [there] fore our object should be to oppose the tendency of the American Colonization Society." British abolitionists felt the publication of the "Protest" destroyed the ACS's credibility in the UK.³⁷ Denouncing the objectives of the American Colonization Society was one thing; openly supporting the radical Garrison and his fellow immediatists in America, was quite another.

The London elites remained wary of offending American sentimentalities, both in politics and public opinion, considering the Apprenticeship system's glaring failure to actually free British colonial slaves. Garrison admitted such, complaining the act was nothing more than "a complete triumph of colonial chicanery over the philanthropy of the British people...not an example for us to imitate, but a precedent for us to shun."³⁸ *AASR* deemed the Act "absurd...liberty by degrees."³⁹ The *Abolitionist*, the British and Foreign Society for the Universal Abolition of Negro Slavery and the Slave Trade paper, admitted,

We regret that the exemplary conduct of the emancipated negroes has not met with a corresponding return from many of their masters. The haughty,

³⁶ *AR*, "Intelligence" (July, 1833), pp. 145-146, *Colonizationist*, "Edinburgh Ladies' Colonization Society" (August, 1833), pp. 116-117, "Great Meeting in Philadelphia" (January, 1834), pp. 288-289, "Aid from Scotland" (January, 1834), p. 192

³⁷ *Colonizationist*, "Opposition to Colonization" (September, 1833), pp. 133-137, "British Protest Against Colonization" (November, 1833), pp. 212-215, *SIA*, "Brief Notices of the Progress of Abolition," 1 (July, 1836), p. 5, GES, *First Annual Report*, pp. 1-12, Cropper to Garrison (5 July 1883), in Taylor, *BAA*, p. 24

³⁸ Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, p. 11

³⁹ *AASR*, "British West Indies" (January, 1835), pp. 4-7

domineering, and revengeful spirit engendered by the slave system, is still in existence and operation.⁴⁰

GES described the Apprenticeship Program as,

A very foolish system...an intermediate step between Slavery and Freedom, was enacted by the Collective Wisdom of the British Parliament, besides a Compensation to the Planters, of Twenty Millions sterling... remnant of slavery.⁴¹

In light of the British mood towards the US, many Britons disassociated themselves from America's guilt, refusing to commit time or money to the cause, despite enthusiastically criticizing the institution. Reverend Thomas Price, editor of *Slavery in America*, summed up the general consensus:

We must protest against the inference being drawn that we feel less interested in American Abolition movements...as a nation, we are too deeply implicated in the chicanery and deception which are practiced in our own colonies, to warrant the withdrawal of any portion of our efforts to nations over whom we have no political influence, and where our national character is no ways implicated.⁴²

GES secretaries, John Murray and William Smeal, criticized the British anti-slavery public for abandoning their posts; not having the right to interfere in American affairs and duty only to the slaves of the Empire were common excuses. They were disappointed that, in the wake of the Abolition Act of 1833, most anti-slavery societies dissolved, despite slavery still existing worldwide and throughout the Empire.⁴³

North of the border the situation remained fluid. Scots, unlike their London counterparts, seized the opportunity to help, while several British societies presumed their duty had been discharged. In fact, the London Agency committee planned to reduce their organization, halting publication of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* for over a year, while several auxiliaries became inactive, a few even refusing to re-organize concerned over “stirring up the [slavery] question.”⁴⁴ The GASS ceased meeting in January 1833.⁴⁵ Founding member

⁴⁰ *Abolitionist* (British) quoted in Vermont Anti-Slavery Society, *First annual report of the Vermont Anti-Slavery Society* (Montpelier, 1835), p. 11

⁴¹ GES, *First Annual Report*, p. 17

⁴² *SIA*, “Preface” (August, 1837), pp. iii-iv

⁴³ GES, *Address of the Glasgow Emancipation Society—To the Friends of the Enslaved, in Scotland, England, and Ireland* (Glasgow, 1836)

⁴⁴ Charles H. Wesley, “The Abolition of Negro Apprenticeship in the British Empire,” *Journal of Negro History*, 23:2 (April, 1938), pp. 155-59

Rev. Wardlaw hailed the Emancipation Act of 1833 as a triumph, “the glorious announcement of the day is that slavery is, henceforth, utterly and for ever abolished, and declared unlawful, throughout the British colonies, plantations, and possessions abroad.”⁴⁶ Although the group had targeted the West Indies, as early as 1826 they discussed total and immediate abolition without planter compensation. At this time, most abolitionists favoured instantly commencing a process of gradual emancipation for slaves, not immediate freedom, which GES later advocated.⁴⁷

Several former Glasgow “friends of negro emancipation”—Heugh, Murray, Smeal, Wardlaw, Anthony Wigham—later founded GES.⁴⁸ The second notice, directed at members of the clergy, followed the meeting held 7 December 1833. Resolutions were drawn up, prioritizing American enslavement whilst declaring slavery to be “inconsistent with the spirit and precepts of Christianity, and subversive to the best interest of mankind.”⁴⁹ By year's end, Scots established two major abolition associations, the Glasgow and Edinburgh Emancipation Societies, several months before any similar English society; followed in January 1834 by a Glasgow ladies auxiliary, making American slavery the priority, and covering the complete cost of Thompson's US lecture tour.⁵⁰ The London Agency Anti-Slavery committee, the younger, more progressive of the London anti-slavery groups, praised Glasgow's “promptness, zeal and liberality...evinced in the Cause of Universal Abolition...the flame that Scotland was the first to kindle.”⁵¹

What precipitated such a quick and decisive response from Scotland? What made Scots more willing to join American abolitionists? Rice believed the enthusiastic and independent response from Scotland during the 1830s belied specific “Scottish antagonisms, both at home and abroad,” reinforced by well-established Scotch-American connections. Despite acknowledging that evangelicalism and genuine empathy influenced Scotland's benevolent response to American slavery, he agreed with George Shepperson's appraisal that claimed Scots utilized “events in the New World to bring into focus its own

⁴⁵ *Scots Times*, “Glasgow Anti-Slavery” (27 January 1833)

⁴⁶ Ralph Wardlaw, *The jubilee: a sermon* (Glasgow, 1834), p. 20

⁴⁷ Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, p. 23, David Byron Davis, “The Emergence of Immediatism in British and American Antislavery Thought,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 49:2 (September, 1962), pp. 209-30

⁴⁸ *ASR*, “Glasgow,” 4:2 (5 January 1831), pp. 34-39, *GESMB*, pp. 1-7 (5-12 December 1833)

⁴⁹ *GES*, *First Annual Report*, p. 3, *GESMB*, pp. 3-4 (7 December 1833)

⁵⁰ *GESMB*, p. 2 (6 December 1833), *EES*, *First Annual Report* (Edinburgh, 1835), p. 1, Glasgow Ladies Auxiliary Emancipation Society, *Three Years' Female Anti-Slavery Effort, in Britain and America* (Glasgow, 1837)

⁵¹ *AASR*, “Mission to the United States,” 1:1 (August, 1834), pp. 34-37, *GESMB*, pp. 23-24, George Thompson to GES (24 February 1834)

situation in the Old.”⁵² Whyte surmised that US efforts were the rational progression of an already established anti-slavery tradition, the legacy of unique religious and secular impulses.⁵³ Both historians captured the essence of Scottish anti-slavery feeling; however, the American dimension is far more complex than either of the two studies divulge. This connection is further discussed in Chapter II.

Glasgow Emancipation Society committee members—social, political and religious factors

The anti-slavery society that emerged in late 1833 was, in many ways, not a continuation of the old GASS. Although former members joined GES, the core doctrine of the new society was more absolutist and progressive. The ethos of the Glasgow Emancipation Society centered around two fundamental convictions—Christian integrity and staunch abolitionist principles. Their concern for the slave was not paternalistic; it was based on their beliefs concerning civil and religious liberty, and the universal rights of man. The core members, especially the co-secretaries, John Murray and William Smeal, viewed slaves as equals, not persons in need of Christianizing or civilizing as a precursor to freedom. In their opinion, all men, regardless of their race, religion or social standing, was entitled to civil rights. Not only were they reformers in the social, political and religious sense, they were, in general, devout Christians with fervent, evangelical standards. The crime of slavery and slaveholding was an affront to their democratic ideals; in the same vein, it defamed their church and was at odds with their religious convictions.

In line with their penchant for abolition, a large portion of GES concurrently championed other sociopolitical issues. Although the members represented a diverse mix of society, including several different denominations, diverging professions, and varied backgrounds, they were mainly middle class philanthropists, committed to the moral and social improvement of mankind. Their pursuits often overlapped, creating a solid network of like-minded individuals—those who led GES often were regional leaders in other major causes. The members had international connections and, in some instances, experienced life abroad in Asia, North America, and the West Indies. The Glaswegian abolitionists were not insular; they considered themselves part of a global brotherhood and were deeply interested in the progression and welfare of foreign countries. They were also men of their

⁵² Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, pp. 27-29, George Shepperson, "Writings in Scottish-American History: A Brief Survey," *William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 6 (April, 1954), p. 173

⁵³ Whyte, *Abolition of Black Slavery*, pp. 243, 54-55

time, immersed in the nineteenth century periodical press; Glasgow witnessed the profusion of coffee houses, libraries and reading rooms that provided domestic and international commentary, culture and news. For the men of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, slavery symbolized all that was wrong in modern society and eradicating American slavery, in particular, was patently key to redressing the injustice.

The men that served on GES generally typified two social groups—religious and political. Members, such as William Anderson, James Beith, William Kidston, James McTear, John Murray and William Smeal, consistently laboured in both spheres, while the vast majority prioritized their respective fields—ministers touted Voluntarism and religious liberty; laymen espoused broad political reform. In general, most advocated social reforms aimed at alleviating the suffering of the lower classes. The following overview aims to show how the Glasgow Emancipation Society operated within an intricate network of progressively minded individuals, highlighting how their various endeavors, as well as prevailing social, economic and political circumstances, influenced their behaviour and policies.

One of the largest groups associated with the Glasgow abolitionists was the Voluntary Church Society. Revs. Kidston and Wardlaw both studied under biblical scholar George Lawson. During the “Old Light” and “New Light” controversy, Lawson led a minority group that dissented from the Preamble declaration (New Light), advocating a thorough and complete change to the Church and State relationship, the precursor of the later Voluntary principle. He was also known for promoting religious toleration.⁵⁴ By the 1830s, Scottish Dissenters and Catholics had obtained civil and political rights, in varying degrees. In the run up to the Reform Bill of 1832, non-establishment denominations, with Reformers and Roman Catholics, formed a powerful pseudo-political contingent to achieve extension of the franchise and parliamentary representation.

When GES founded in 1833, its membership included some of Scotland’s leading Voluntaries—Revs. W. Anderson, Greville Ewing, Hugh Heugh, David King and Ralph Wardlaw. The Glasgow society, as a whole, contained at least twenty Voluntary churchmen. The Edinburgh Emancipation Society had significantly less, Dr. John Ritchie of Potterow being the most active member.⁵⁵ Voluntary lectures often alluded to the

⁵⁴ *GM*, “Rev. Ralph Wardlaw,” p. 653, John Macfarlane, *The Life and Times of George Lawson* (Edinburgh, 1862), 355-356

⁵⁵ *CM*, “Edinburgh Voluntary Church Society” (31 January 1833), “Voluntary Church Controversy” (7 October 1833), “Voluntary Soiree” (29 November 1838). Other GES Voluntaries: David Anderson, William Auld, James Beith, G. C. Dick, John Edwards, Alexander Harvey, James

separation of Church and State as vital to securing civil and religious freedoms—a fundamental principle of GES. As men of faith, they felt the church needed to be divorced from the State to allow pure, unsullied Christianity. As “Patriots and freemen,” they wanted the State to be governed by secular means, without the prejudicial influence of religion.⁵⁶ As with their anti-slavery activities, Scottish Voluntaries successfully lobbied in Parliament, attracting the attention of government entities, and were conspicuously covered in the national media.

Their “us and them” mentality was mirrored not only in the ethos of GES, who rejected all gradualist and apologist arguments concerning slavery, but also in radical reformist ideology. The Voluntaries were wary of State influence in religion, in the same way they distrusted government efforts to alleviate slavery and the slave trade. Purging the church of secular interference paralleled their efforts to purify US churches of pro-slavery influence. The movement in Scotland was seen as the democratic politicizing of the middle class, clerical and lay, in response to the disproportionate power of the aristocracy and government. Established churches were yet another form of social control, which violated one’s personal liberties.⁵⁷ Revs. Anderson, Heugh, Ritchie and Wardlaw, in particular, were known for their fierce orations against the Church of Scotland. Critics from both conservative and moderate groups, however, viewed their actions as threatening social stability and accused Scottish Voluntaries of leaguings with infidels and radicals to achieve their goals.⁵⁸

Nonetheless, the men involved in the Voluntary church debate were no strangers to controversy. In the 1800s, Edinburgh and Glasgow established popular auxiliaries in support of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Leaders in GES headed the Glaswegian branch—Anderson, Ewing, Heugh, Kidston, Smeal, Watson, Willis and Wardlaw. Drs. Andrew Thomson and Ritchie led the Edinburgh contingent. By 1826, the London society was under threat for having distributed Bibles abroad that included doctrine offensive to

Johnston, Patrick Lethem, William Lindsay, David McLaren, John McLeod, Peter McOwan, John Murray, Andrew Young, and George Watson.

⁵⁶ *Glasgow Voluntary Church Society, Lectures on Church Establishments* (Glasgow, 1835), Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, pp. 208-210

⁵⁷ *Blackwood’s Magazine*, “The Voluntary Principle,” reprinted in *Berrow’s Worcester Journal* (8 December 1836), *Manchester Times and Gazette*, “The Compulsory and Voluntary Systems” (30 April 1836)

⁵⁸ *AJ*, “Voluntarism Not So Strong as Some People Imagine” (19 August 1835), *Bradford Observer*, “Dissent and Democracy” (16 November 1837), *CM*, “Western Independent” (30 August 1834), “Voluntary Meeting” (6 January 1838), *Report of the Discussion on Civil Establishments of Religion* (Belfast, 1837)

Scottish Protestants. The Apocrypha dispute initially divided Bible societies almost distinctly along ethnic lines. The Scots, led by Thomson, seceded from BFBS in protest over the inclusion of Apocrypha writings, which they felt sullied pure Scriptural doctrine and was linked to Roman Catholicism. Furthermore, the matter was debated within the Edinburgh Court of Session. English auxiliaries, though, stayed virtually intact.⁵⁹

The schism was not due to Scottish-English antagonisms; it reflected fundamentally different theological attitudes. Although several English ministers remonstrated with BFBS over the Apocrypha, the majority were unwilling to undermine the national association, especially since their largest donor approved of the inclusion. On the other hand, Scottish Protestants, with their strong Calvinistic tradition, largely opposed it and, rather than compromise their own doctrinal values, established an independent Scottish Bible Society. In Glasgow, though, the controversy split the society. Several clergymen, led by Kidston and Wardlaw, continued as an auxiliary to the more prestigious BFBS and, in consequence, were at odds with the majority of Scottish Bible groups. The secessionists, led by Heugh and Willis, founded an independent society, in line with Thomson's Edinburgh association. By 1833, when the Edinburgh and Glasgow Emancipation societies established, the Apocrypha issue remained divisive in Scotland and England.⁶⁰ Overall, the Glasgow abolitionists involved, both auxiliary and secession, depreciated BFBS's handling of the situation and objected to the usage of their donations for Apocrypha texts. Since some London members were affiliated with LASS and later BFASS, this explains why GES refused to become an auxiliary—independence ensured their objectives and principles were complied with.

Temperance, like the Apocrypha issue, divided Scottish Christians, including members of GES. The American movement, which expanded in the mid-1820s in concert with revival activity, encouraged the proliferation of abstinence groups throughout Scotland, especially in Glasgow. Most commentary, clerical and lay, agreed that drunkenness was morally corruptive and a national evil; others deemed intemperance a health threat, especially to the lower classes. Dissenters, Quakers and others denominations espoused the concept, although only a fraction of establishment clergy signed on, some CoS ministers viewing

⁵⁹ *CM*, "Glasgow Auxiliary Bible Society" (20 November 1826), "Edinburgh Bible Society" (12 July 1827), *GH*, "Court of Session" (22 May 1826), "Edinburgh Bible Society" (10 July 1826), "Glasgow Bible Society" (20 November 1826). In 1831, an alternative Bible society was formed in England, which rejected the Apocrypha, but included Catholics and Unitarians.

⁶⁰ *AJ*, "Aberdeen Bible Society" (25 December 1833), *CM* "Edinburgh Bible Society" (18 May 1833), *Newcastle Courant*, "Glasgow Auxiliary Bible Society" (17 November 1827)

temperance as another ploy to disestablish the State church. The crux of the matter was related more so to the extent of abstinence—spirits only or all alcoholic beverages. Like the more extreme form, teetotalism, conservatives and moderates felt abstinence was at odds with local customs, including certain religious practices.

Several GES members were Scottish Temperance Society leaders. By 1831, Glasgow's branch was the largest in Scotland with over eight thousand subscribing members. Revs. Anderson, W. Auld, P. Brewster, E. Campbell, and Willis, along with R. Kettle, P. Lethem, W. Paton, Smeal, and Dr. Watson, were office-bearers in the Glaswegian association. GES secretary, John Murray, who previously made a living as a spirit-dealer, became a teetotaler. Abolitionists Dr. Ritchie and Alexander Cruickshank led efforts in Edinburgh.⁶¹ Temperance adherents believed the movement was founded on benevolent, philanthropic, and, more importantly, Christian principles. Other prominent GES committeemen, nevertheless, refrained from joining, even though they supported the concept in theory. Many felt the "moralists" were too absolutist, their policies were not based on Scripture and threatened to legislate social and religious practices. Temperance was particularly divisive in Scotland, where cultural drinking habits remained ingrained, and by 1835, lacking consequential support at home, Scottish societies aligned themselves with the more prestigious British and Foreign Temperance Society.⁶²

Temperance was intricately linked with Victorian middle class ideas of self-improvement. GES members Rev. George Jeffrey, Andrew Paton, Robert Reid and William Smeal amply supported the Scottish Temperance League, while Ebenezer Anderson and James Turner presided over the Glasgow Total Abstinence Society.⁶³ Hibernian Anti-Slavery Society leaders Richard Allen, James Haughton and Richard Webb were prominent Irish Temperance Union members and BFASS committeemen, G. W. Alexander, Joseph Sturge and Josiah Forster, backed the national association. Noted American abolitionists, especially Garrisonians, were steadfast teetotalers and temperance observers. In America, as in Britain, the practice of abstinence or teetotalism was linked with evangelical activity, attracting a diverse mix of Christian sects. In Scotland, even Glaswegian working class reformers and Chartists advocated abstinence, along with self-instruction, as a means to

⁶¹ *CM*, "Temperance Societies" (22 March 1830, 2 February 1832, 5 March 1832, 14 February 1833)

⁶² *CM*, "Edinburgh Temperance Society" (10 December 1835)

⁶³ *GH*, "Anniversary of the Scottish Temperance League" (29 April 1853), *The British Temperance League* (Edinburgh, 1847). Scottish founder, John Dunlop, often associated intemperance with social stagnation.

improve their social and political condition.⁶⁴ The clergy and upper classes, in general, remained aloof from temperance, only endorsing those restrictions targeting the lower class. Visiting Americans, including Frederick Douglass, commented on the proliferation of drinking amongst affluent Scots; they were especially surprised that eminent, avowedly evangelical clergymen also partook in the custom.⁶⁵

The Glasgow Peace Society was another quasi-religious organization linked with temperance. Although Peace societies founded in America in the 1810s, the end of the Napoleonic Wars and transatlantic revival activity helped expand the movement in Britain. As with slavery, peace proponents believed war was inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity and interests of mankind. To the Reformer, the cost of military armaments during peace and war was an overwhelming public burden, impacting social, cultural and economic interests. The national society, founded in 1816, included several anti-slavery men, such as John Bowring, Thomas Clarkson and Thomas Sturge. In Edinburgh, Quaker men, such as the Wighams and Alexander Cruickshank, along with Dr. Ritchie, supported the cause. The original Glasgow society was led by William Smeal and Anthony Wigham, both Quakers; later supported by several other GES members, including Hugh Brown, Henry Langland, and John Murray. The Glaswegian association often received intelligence and pamphlets from their American contacts and, in return, Scottish opinion was circulated in various US journals.⁶⁶

Although Quakers led the British movement, they were quite evangelical in nature and, consequently, opposed other acts of violence, including military floggings and the death penalty. In 1819, the Glasgow society disavowed all political intercourse, but welcomed those generally interested in promoting peace through Christian means.⁶⁷ Over the years the principles of peace and non-resistance became somewhat blurred. William Lloyd Garrison advocated moral suasion and rejected violence under all circumstances, an

⁶⁴ *Chartist Circular*, "Temperance and Liberty" (26 December 1840), Fiona Ann Montgomery, *Glasgow Radicalism 1830-1848* (PhD, University of Glasgow, 1974), pp. 30-32, 211-212

⁶⁵ *Industrial Magazine*, "The British League," 1:2 (April, 1847), p. 33, *Journal of the American Temperance Union*, "Scotland," vol. 9-11 (New York, 1845-47), pp. 62, 78, 140-141, *The Proceedings of the World Temperance Convention* (London, 1846). The *Industrial* was the organ of the Scottish Patriotic Society, an exclusive upper class association that took a paternalistic view to improving the working classes.

⁶⁶ *Friend of Peace*, "Recent Annual Reports of Peace Societies," 2:9 (Boston, 1821), pp. 36-37, *Herald of Peace*, "Subscriptions" (London, 1846), p. 112, Society for the Promotion of Permanent and Universal Peace, *Sixth Annual Report* (London, 1822), -----, *Third Annual Report* (London, 1819)

⁶⁷ Glasgow Peace Society, *Address of the Glasgow Peace Society* (Glasgow, 1819)

ideology too radical for the American Peace Society.⁶⁸ The Glasgow Emancipation Society also prioritized moral suasion, but, at times, deemed slave insurrections as justifiable to protect their liberties. The Glasgow Anti-War association promoted peaceful relations between America and Britain and were against further Imperial warfare. Its leaders were active GES committeemen and the society itself publicly opposed the Afghan War.⁶⁹ British Peace societies from the 1840s to 1860s utilized propaganda and political means to air their concerns, yet, they were still ideologically divided—pacifists believed war was unlawful; others did not object to war in all situations, but aimed to discourage the “war spirit” and reduce national armaments. The variance of opinion did not divide the British Peace community, which was thoroughly represented by both Scottish and English abolitionists, even during the American Civil War.⁷⁰

Reformers of all political persuasions prolifically and consistently supported GES. At the time of the Reform Bill for Scotland (1832), Glasgow had two prominent middle class reform bodies: the Political Union and the Reform Association. The GPU was more popular, attracting members from the trades, the Crow Club and GRA, and espoused broader social and political reforms. The latter derived from the exclusive Clique, representing men of affluence, including wealthy merchants like James Oswald.⁷¹ In 1833, several GPU and GRA members joined the Glasgow Emancipation Society, along with several ministerial Reform Bill supporters, such as Revs. Anderson, Kidston, King, and McTear. Although men of substance, GES affiliates James Beith, William Craig and James Turner of Thrushgrove, were considered radicals for consistently backing franchise extension and other class-inclusive reforms. Robert Grahame of Whitehill, GES’s President and Glasgow’s first post-Reform Bill Lord Provost, was a leading Scottish democrat, who supported both American and French revolutionaries and defended British reformers, such as Thomas Muir.⁷² His appointment as the figurehead of GES spoke volumes, in relation to the society’s political standpoint.

⁶⁸ *Advocate of Peace*, “Mr. Garrison’s Views on Peace,” 4 (March, 1838), pp. 187-188

⁶⁹ *GESMB*, pp. 150-151 (15 October 1839), *Proceedings at the public meeting of the Glasgow Anti-War Society* (Glasgow, 1846). Anti-War GES members: John Murray, Andrew Paton, Robert Reid, George Thompson, James Turner, and William Smeal.

⁷⁰ *British Friend*, “Edinburgh Peace Conference,” 10, 11:11 (1 October, 1 November 1853), pp. 254-256, 267-279, *CM*, “The Peace Society and the American Question” (5 September 1862), *Hogg’s Weekly Instructor*, “Peace Societies,” 3:61 (25 April 1846), *Proceedings of the First General Peace Convention* (London, 1843)

⁷¹ *AJ*, “Glasgow Reform Association” (3 October 1832), Montgomery, *Glasgow Radicalism*, pp. 70-76, 97-98, *RG*, “Glasgow Political Union” (24 December 1831)

⁷² *GES*, *First Annual*, pp. 4, 47, *GESMB*, pp. 10-11 (January 21, 1834), *GM*, “Robert Grahame, Esq.” (January-June, 1852), p. 303, Peter Mackenzie, *Old Reminiscences of Glasgow and the West of Scotland* (Glasgow, 1890), II, pp. 224-252

During the 1830s, several GES abolitionists were actively supporting working class reforms. Through the Glasgow Political Union, Craig, Fleming, Grahame, and Turner fostered class cooperation in opposition to conservatism. Craig, in particular, believed the people, not the landed elite, should be represented.⁷³ The CPU, a more radical alternative to GRA, also advocated a national system of education and petitioned the House of Commons. Middle and working class reformers felt poverty, inequality and political injustice were directly linked with the current preferential education system, which left the majority of lower classes uneducated. Withholding education to the masses perpetuated the class system in the same way it kept Negro slaves ignorant. GES promoted the idea that all men, despite class or colour, possessed moral and intellectual capabilities. Smeal, in particular, prioritized education reform and the cause itself was amply supported in Glasgow.⁷⁴ In 1835, radical reformers welcomed the Irish politician, Daniel O’Connell. GES wanted to officially acknowledge O’Connell for his anti-slavery and humanitarian advocacy. Within the society, though, conservative members opposed O’Connell, viewing him as the “Great Agitator,” and objected to GES being linked with the Irish question and other radical reforms. By majority, the Glasgow society publicly confirmed O’Connell as an Honorary member. Several committeemen, led by Grahame, also attended local political events honouring O’Connell.⁷⁵

Reformers in Glasgow were inevitably split over the scope of reforms required. The moderates vacillated in their support for further reform, especially resisting calls to extend the franchise to the working class. Radicals, on the other hand, continued to encourage class cooperation and complete suffrage. GES members supported the Anti-Corn Law Association, Chartism, and the Complete Suffrage Union in varying degrees. The ACLA was exclusive and membership restricted by high subscriptions; however, the majority of GES championed the cause for humanitarian and free trade reasons.⁷⁶ Conflict arose

⁷³ *CM*, “Durham Festival” (30 October 1834), *GA*, “Glasgow Political Union” (9 December 1836), Montgomery, *Glasgow Radicalism*, pp. 112-114, 160-162, 182

⁷⁴ *Chartist Circular*, “National Education” 26 October 1839), *CM*, “House of Commons” 25 December 1837), GES to James McCune Smith, reprinted in GES, *Third Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1837), pp. 124-125, Joseph Joshua Green, “William Smeal Obit,” in *The Annual Monitor for 1878* (London, 1878), p. 153, *Leicester Chronicle*, “The Working Classes and National Education” (13 January 1838)

⁷⁵ *AJ*, “Mr. Connell in Glasgow” (30 September 1835), *CM*, “Mr. O’Connell’s Visit to Glasgow” (24 September 1835), “Mr. O’Connell” (26 September 1835), *GESMB*, pp. 64-72 (19-23 September 1835)

⁷⁶ *CM*, “Corn and Provision Laws-Public Meeting” (15 December 1842), “Anti-Corn Law Meeting” (14 December 1853), *GH*, “Anti-Corn Law Meeting” (16 January 1846), *RG*, “The Corn Laws,” 4:110 (28 December 1833). GES Repealers: Revs. Anderson, Burns, Eadie, Harvey,

between ACLA and CSU when the Repealers refused to endorse complete enfranchisement. Yet, Walter Buchanan and other GES committeemen often sought consensus and encouraged operative participation to achieve both objectives. The more radical anti-slavery members, Craig and Turner, worked closely with local Chartists, while Brewster, Murray, A. Paton, Smeal and J. Ure endorsed moral force Chartism.⁷⁷ Turner, a self-made man and landowner, was an associate of Scottish reformer Joseph Hume, who consistently argued in Parliament on behalf of British workers. Like several GES reformers, Hume felt the Reform Bill of 1832 failed to achieve fair and equal rights for the labouring classes.⁷⁸

British anti-slavery leaders were consistently involved in Repeal, but generally shied away from franchise issues. Chartism, sometimes linked with physical agitation, was considered too radical for most middle class benevolent societies. In general, much of the middle and upper classes deemed the “lower orders” as incompetent, not worthy of suffrage. By the 1840s, though, George Thompson and Joseph Sturge championed complete suffrage, hoping to ally with moral force Chartists, along with EES’s Dr. Ritchie and Anti-Corn leader John Dunlop. Noted female abolitionists Harriet Martineau and Elizabeth Pease favoured moral force Chartism and Pease’s father, Joseph, sympathized with the movement. American abolitionists John Collins, James and Lucretia Mott and Charles Remond backed suffrage extension, whereas Garrison, Douglass and Wright promoted Chartist principles, lecturing at both CSU and Chartist meetings. GES publicly welcomed national Chartist Henry Vincent to its eleventh annual meeting, yet, BFASS refused to endorse Sturge’s complete suffrage campaign.⁷⁹

Cooperation between leading Chartist and suffragists in Glasgow was equally reflected in the make-up of the Emancipation Society. The schism of 1840-41, especially with the inclusion of prominent Chartist adherents, marked a turning point for GES, which became overtly political and militant in its rhetoric and policies.⁸⁰ From the 1840s onward,

Heugh, Jeffrey, Kidston, King, Lindsay, and Wardlaw; Messrs. Buchanan, Craig, Hastie, Oswald, W. Paton, J. Reid, Smeal, and Ure.

⁷⁷ John McAdam, *Autobiography of John McAdam (1806-1883)*, ed. Janet Fyfe (Edinburgh, 1980), pp. 16-17, 227-228, Montgomery, *Glasgow Radicalism*, pp. 188-194, 200-201

⁷⁸ CM, “Public Meeting at Glasgow” (1 January 1838), Thomas Curson Hansard, *Hansard’s Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd Series, vol. XLIX (London, 1839), pp. 252-258

⁷⁹ *Bradford Observer*, “The Suffrage Movement in Glasgow” (13 October 1842), CM, “Complete Suffrage Union” (7 May 1842), “Edinburgh Complete Suffrage Association” (1 October 1842), *GESMB*, pp. 274-278 (17 July 1845), *GH*, “Glasgow Emancipation Society” (4 August 1845), Fladeland, “Our Cause,” pp. 69-99

⁸⁰ *GESMB*, pp. 176-177 (10 August 1840), pp. 199-201 (27 April 1841)

reformers dominated and society meetings reflected such; GES increasingly discussing domestic and foreign political matters—African and Indian emigration schemes, annexation of Texas, Amistad detainment, Brazilian and Cuban trade agreements with Britain, Indian liberation, and war in Afghanistan. Concurrently, the society attacked both the Evangelical Alliance and the Free Church of Scotland for their refusal to condemn US slaveholders.⁸¹ During this time, GES's committee gained several affluent politicians, including Glasgow magistrate Alexander Hastie (later MP), and MPs John Dennistoun and James Oswald. The committee had fewer clerical members, but was overwhelmingly represented by Glaswegian reformers, moderate and radical. Visits from American social reformers, Collins, Garrison and Wright, likewise influenced society policies.⁸²

Outwith the society, GES members increasingly led regional political campaigns. The Glasgow Electoral Association, headed by GES's A. Paton, J. Rattray, and Turner, united local reformers looking to secure manhood suffrage for the working classes, along with the ballot and shorter Parliaments. Resurgent campaigning coincided with attempts by Joseph Hume to secure voter extension in the Commons.⁸³ By the 1850s, at least twenty active GES associates participated in the Glasgow Parliamentary Reform Association, supported by working class leaders, which demanded equal political representation for Scotland, household suffrage, vote by ballot, and triennial Parliaments. GES secretaries, Paton and Smeal, along with Rev. Anderson and Thompson, in particular, were conspicuously involved with the organization for several decades.⁸⁴ GES also supported various exiled patriots, like Louis Kossuth, endorsing revolutionary activity against illiberal, oppressive governments. GES's second President, Professor John P. Nichol, with Rev. Anderson, Rev. Crosskey, and James Turner, organized public events in honour of the Hungarian leader. Anderson also befriended Italian revolutionaries, Giuseppe Garibaldi and Giuseppe Mazzini.⁸⁵

⁸¹ *GESMB*, pp. 219-276 (18 November 1841-17 July 1845)

⁸² GES, *Eight Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1842), p. 6, ----, *Ninth Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1843), pp. 12-13

⁸³ *GH*, "Electoral Association for Glasgow" (7 April 1848), "The Franchise" (22 September 1848), "Reform Banquet" (8 December 1848)

⁸⁴ *CM*, "Parliamentary Reform Meeting" (2 February 1859), "Glasgow Reform Association" (30 November 1858), *Daily News*, "Meeting at Glasgow" (28 November 1849), *GH*, "Parliamentary Reform" (19 April 1852), "Reform Meeting in the City Hall" (17 May 1854), "Glasgow Reform Committee" (21 March 1860), "Parliamentary Reform" (21 September 1865). Other GES GPA members: Buchanan, James and John Cairns, W. Cochran, Crosskey, R. Galt, W. Govan and son, Hastie, G. Jeffrey, J. Knox, Prof P. Nichol and son, J. B. Ross, Turner, and Ure.

⁸⁵ *CM*, "Soiree in Honour of Kossuth in Glasgow (10 July 1854), GES to Louis Kossuth, reprinted in *British Friend*, "Louis Kossuth, Peace, and American Slavery," 9:12 (1 December 1851), p. 296,

In many respects it is difficult to regard the Glasgow Emancipation Society as just another middle class, evangelical reform association. There were various gradations of status amongst the members. Some were quite wealthy, like Robert Grahame, James Oswald, and William P. Paton; others were prominent in society, such as Hugh Heugh, David King and Ralph Wardlaw, who was equally prosperous. The majority of GES, though, were men of substance, although several members came from modest, working class backgrounds, including Rev. William Anderson and James Turner. Even in religion, the society's make-up was varied. The original group attracted Dissenters, CoS members, and Quakers; however, in later years Morisonians and Unitarians joined. Most were social, political and religious reformers, but even in that sense, they differed. Unlike Edinburgh and other British anti-slavery groups, GES was not defined by its more affluent leaders. Men like Grahame and Wardlaw brought respectability and prominence, but John Murray and William Smeal fundamentally led the society and, more often than not, guided its policies and behaviour. Much of the historiography concerning GES neglects Murray, Smeal and many other active committeemen, yet, their contribution to the legacy Glaswegian abolition is vitally important.

GH, "The Glasgow Address to Kossuth" (31 October 1851), "M. Kossuth in Glasgow" (28 May 1859), George Gilfillan, *Life of the Rev. William Anderson* (London, 1873), pp. 97-100

The Scottish-American connection

Chapter II

The United States of America are our sister land. Like us, they boast of freedom--like us, they are pouring the Bible and light all over the world—and like us, they disgrace their professions and tarnish their fair name, by keeping slaves. Freemen, like us; and like us, slave masters.

They lay this sin to our charge, and unquestionably the guilt of its origin is ours. They are our progeny--they were long the subject of our laws...The guilt of the consent and the continuance is theirs; but, as the crime of temptation was ours, we owe them, on this head, all the amends which holy love can make.

Charles Stuart⁸⁶

Slave Economics—reciprocal commerce in slaving, tobacco and cotton

From the early eighteenth century until the Civil War, Scotland profited from the infamous triangular trade, which transported enslaved West Africans to the New World, exchanging human cargo for merchandise directly imported into Great Britain. Evidence implicating Scots directly in the slave trade is on the rise, although still not as prolific as in England, demonstrating Scotland was more than just a bit player in slaving. At the highest level of trading, Scots held one fifth of the premier positions within the Company of Merchants Trading to Africa. Scotland's ports rarely dispatched human cargo ships, but this did not stop the intrepid Scotsman. In Bristol, Robert Gordon was responsible for 18 different slave voyages, involving twelve ships, which represented three percent of the local trade; in Liverpool at least five Scots managed slave firms; and in London, by mid-eighteenth century, there were 135 Scottish traders, this number steadily increasing over the years. In Africa, they consistently held key positions as factors, surgeons, storekeepers, warehousemen and clerks, including manual labor positions as carpenters and joiners, many linked through familial ties. Younger Scots became successful independent traders. One such partnership, Thomas Melville, Jr., Ebenezer Young and Matthew Mackaill, traded slaves to America, while importing gold and ivory to Britain. They figured prominently as plantation factors and owners who purchased from slave traders, linking Scottish commercial interests directly to the sale of slaves.⁸⁷

⁸⁶ *Patriot*, "Charles Stuart to Editor of London" (11 January 1833)

⁸⁷ David Hancock, "Scots in the Slave Trade", in *Nation and Province in the First British Empire*, ed., Ned Landsman (London, 2001), pp. 63-93. The Company of Merchants Trading to Africa was formed in 1750, taking over for the defunct Royal African Company.

Another Scotsman, James Tweed, wrote *Considerations and remarks on the present state of the trade to Africa* (1771) based on his twenty years experience in the slave trade. Like many other Scots, he traveled to Africa for employment as a young man and became familiar with various British posts on the Windward and Gold Coast, including Sierra Leone. Tweed's letter advocated stricter government regulation of the trade due to the influx of "renegados" and the French, who hindered British trafficking of slaves to America and the West Indies.⁸⁸ The Windward Coast attracted numerous Scots; one "factory" alone sold approximately 13,000 slaves to the Americas; traders often acted in concert with Scottish merchants who integrated slaving into their transatlantic commercial operations. By the 1760s, slave dealing had expanded inland to meet the demand for slaves following the Seven Years' War. Scottish consortiums began accepting contracts from America, including orders for the supply of their own plantations. Bance Island, in particular, directed slaves to customers of the Scottish firm of Grant, Oswald and Co. in Georgia and South Carolina.⁸⁹

Scottish involvement in the slave trade is significant; however, commerce in slave products with America—tobacco and cotton especially—dramatically transformed Scotland's economy. Less than two decades after Union, which allowed Scottish trading access to British colonies, Glasgow was importing the bulk of American slave-grown tobacco. According to one survey, tobacco from Maryland, South Carolina and Virginia accounted for around 80% of all Scottish imports and re-exports before the American war. By 1758, Glasgow had surpassed London's tobacco imports and by 1769 Scotland's overall trade eclipsed England's at 51.8%. Glaswegians established permanent facilities and agents in America. The large Scottish conglomerate of William Cunninghame and Company; Cunninghame, Findlay and Company; and Cunninghame, Brown and Company; held seven warehouses in Maryland and fourteen in Virginia. Scots continued to dominate the American tobacco market through an extensive system of plantation ownership, management and direct trading links. The American War of Independence bolstered Scottish investment in the Caribbean, funded by huge windfall profits from inflated wartime tobacco prices; consequently West Indian slave produce directly supplied Greenock sugar companies, later becoming some of the largest sugar firms in the world.⁹⁰

⁸⁸ James Tweed, *Considerations and remarks on the present state of the trade to Africa* (London, 1771), pp. 1-7, 11, 30-34, 61-85

⁸⁹ Hancock, "Scots in the Slave Trade," pp. 61, 75-79

⁹⁰ T. M. Devine, *Exploring the Scottish Past* (East Linton, 1995), Chapter V, Paula Kitching, Eric Graham, and Iain Whyte, *Scotland and the Slave Trade* (Edinburgh, 2007), pp. 3-5, 15, Jacob M.

The Scottish literati were just beginning to argue against the case for slavery on several grounds. Francis Hutcheson, a professor of Moral Philosophy at Glasgow University, rejected classical explanations for “such a cruel action” which changed “a rational creature into a piece of goods void of all right.”⁹¹ Adam Ferguson of Edinburgh, also a professor of philosophy, declared “no one is born a slave; because everyone is born with all his original rights...the supposed property of the master in the slave, therefore, is a matter of usurpation, not of right.”⁹² The Reverend William Robertson, leader of the Moderate party, described the slave trade in his *History of America* as “an odious commerce...no less repugnant to the feelings of humanity than to the principles of religion.”⁹³ Yet, it was George Wallace, an Edinburgh advocate, who demanded slavery be abandoned, rejecting pro-slavery arguments founded on Enlightenment beliefs of racial inequality and supported through economic rationale. In *A System of the Principles of the Law of Scotland*, Wallace states,

Be it so...that the bulk of mankind ought to be abused, that our pockets may be filled with money, or our mouths with delicacies? The purses of highwaymen would be empty, in case robbery were totally abolished. Let, therefore, our colonies be ruined, but let us not render so many men miserable.⁹⁴

Scotland's public was unwilling to listen. Scottish loyalists who fought for George III during hostilities most certainly had commercial links with the mother country. Likewise, there is evidence to show that Scots merchants remained in Richmond and Petersburg protecting their colonial ties.⁹⁵ In a letter to the *Glasgow Mercury*, one such tradesman urged fellow merchants and traders to refrain from peace talks “until you see whether the recommendations of Congress to the different States of America will operate in your favours or not.” Another championed Scotland's role in the hostilities, as a way of securing “exclusive trade with all our colonies on the continent of America.”⁹⁶ In this respect, the war was not a disaster for Scottish tobacco merchants, who diversified into the West Indian sugar and rum market and returned in force to the American sector.⁹⁷

Price, “The Rise of Glasgow in the Chesapeake Tobacco Trade, 1707-1775,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 11:2 (April, 1954), pp. 179-199

⁹¹ Francis Hutcheson, *A System of Moral Philosophy*, II (London, 1755), p. 213; III, p. 204

⁹² Adam Ferguson, *Institutes of Moral Philosophy* (Edinburgh, 1769), p. 223

⁹³ William Robertson, *History of America*, I, Book Three, Fourth edition (London, 1824), p. 278

⁹⁴ George Wallace, *A System of the Principles of the Law of Scotland*, I (Edinburgh, 1760), pp. 91, 96; Davis David Brion, “New Sidelights on Early Antislavery Radicalism,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 28:4 (October, 1971), pp. 585-89

⁹⁵ Devine, *Exploring the Scottish Past*, p. 89

⁹⁶ Quoted from D. B. Swinfen, “The American Revolution in the Scottish Press,” *New Edinburgh Review* (Edinburgh, 1976), pp. 66-74

⁹⁷ Devine, *Exploring the Scottish Past*, pp. 98-102

Scottish opposition to slavery began in earnest around 1787, after the Quaker-led Society for the Abolition of the Slave Trade organized in London, a surprising development considering Scotland's deep financial commitment to the trade through slave produce, plantation ownership and management. Between 1787 and 1792, anti-slavery societies flourished in Edinburgh, Glasgow, Paisley, Perth and Aberdeen. The Edinburgh Society, chaired by Lord Gardenstone and subscribed by several prominent local ministers, led the country's response publishing petitions, parliamentary resolutions and the House of Commons Select Committee minutes on the slave trade. Glasgow, Paisley and Perth petitions included large representation from trade groups, such as weavers. Aberdeen, like Glasgow, though, had some difficulty in obtaining magisterial support for their protests.⁹⁸

Several Scottish abolitionists linked with the London committee had at one point or another direct contact with the slave trade and slave conditions on Caribbean plantations: William Dickson, author of *Letters on Slavery*, worked as secretary to the Governor of Barbados from 1783-1786; Zachary Macaulay, later editor of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* and member of the Clapham Sect, held an administrative post in Jamaica between 1784-1789; Dr. James Ramsay, who recruited Thomas Clarkson to the movement,⁹⁹ was a naval surgeon and nineteen years resident of St. Kitts; and James Stephen, Sr., legal advisor to Wilberforce, practiced law in St. Kitts. It should be noted, however, that these abolitionists, like Henry Peter Brougham, of Scottish descent, preferred "British" or "English" society and culture. In his twenties, Murray, co-secretary for GES, also ventured to St. Kitts as a trades-man, at some point joining forces with an uncle of George Stephen against slavery.

While anti-slavery efforts in Britain remained focused on the British facet of slavery and the slave trade, one poet brought Scotland's ties to American slavery back into question:

It was in sweet Senegal
That my foes did me enthrall
For the lands of Virginia, -ginia, O!
Torn from that lovely shore,
And must never see it more,
And alas! I am weary, weary, O!
All on that charming coast
Is no bitter snow or frost,
Like the lands of Virginia, -ginia, O!

⁹⁸ Bob Harris, "Scotland's Newspapers, the French Revolution and Domestic Radicalism (c.1789-1794)," *SHR*, 84:217 (April, 2005), pp. 38-62, Whyte, *Abolition of Black Slavery*, pp. 87-91

⁹⁹ Hugh Thomas, *The Slave Trade* (London, 2006), pp. 419-92

There the streams for eve flow,
 And the flowers for ever blow,
 And alas! I am weary, weary, O!
 The burden I must bear,
 While the cruel scourge I fear,
 In the lands of Virginia, -ginia, O!
 And think on friends most dear
 With the bitter, bitter tear,
 And alas! I am weary, weary, O!

"The Slave's Lament"¹⁰⁰

During the nineteenth century West Indian pundits, frequently in contact with American slaveholding communities, threatened to secede from Britain to the US. In 1823, during a debate in the House of Commons, Brougham downplayed the possibility of a British planter revolt, comparing it to the “truly formidable” American War of Independence, as a “menace...trifling.”¹⁰¹ The obstinate West Indian stance, demonstrated in R. Wilmot Horton’s *First Letter to the Freeholders of the County of York*, mirrored *The Crisis* by American Robert Turnbull—both decried legislative interference, the destruction of plantation society/economy, and alluded to possible separation from their respective governments. Horton and *Glasgow Courier* editor, James MacQueen, were accused of being “chief advocates of colonial bondage.”¹⁰²

Scotch-American slavery links peaked in the age of "Cottonacracy" when Southern cotton supplied Britain's vast textile industry. In 1806, according to one contemporary visitor, cotton manufacturing “together with the various arts dependent on it, is now the staple of the west of Scotland.”¹⁰³ The Emancipation Act of 1833 and the termination of the Apprenticeship system in 1838 may have united Britons in the final push to eradicate slavery within certain Imperial dominions; however, during the 1840 World's Anti-Slavery Convention, members were concerned about the economic consequences for Britain and America, and refused to publicly condemn the use of American slave-grown cotton.¹⁰⁴ The dynamic between the needs of commerce and emancipation were often conflicting,

¹⁰⁰ Allan Cunningham, ed., *The Songs of Scotland, Ancient and Modern*, II (London, 1825), pp. 223-34. Robert Burns is often credited for this poem, although this information is not verified.

¹⁰¹ Great Britain House of Commons, *An Authentic Report of the Debate in the House of Commons, June the 23d, 1825, on Mr. Buxton's Motion*, II (London, 1825), pp. 89-91

¹⁰² *ASR*, “Reply to an Attack on the Anti-Slavery Society,” p. 507, Rt. Hon. R. Wilmot Horton, *First Letter to the Freeholders of the County of York, on Negro Slavery* (London, 1830), *ASR*, “Reply to an Attack on the Anti-Slavery Society,” 3:24 (1 December 1830), pp. 497-508, Robert James Turnbull, *The Crisis* (Charleston, 1827)

¹⁰³ Robert Forsyth, *The Beauties of Scotland*, III (Edinburgh, 1806)

¹⁰⁴ Douglas H. Maynard, "The World's Anti-Slavery Convention of 1840," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 47:3 (December, 1960), pp. 461-62

especially when anti-slavery men held direct ties to companies that depended on slave produce. For example, Glaswegian John Dennistoun owned and partnered several cotton spinning factories in the city, commercially linked with Bristol, Liverpool and London, which relied on US cotton. His family had mercantile houses in New Orleans and New York; his brother Alexander briefly immigrating to manage the New Orleans cotton branch, while John visited several times to oversee operations. Despite this, his family was renowned for their benevolence and support of reform. John, in particular, joined GES following the end of Apprenticeship, remaining a Vice-President even during the Civil War.¹⁰⁵ Dennistoun's situation was typical of several GES businessmen that were evangelicals who supported abolition of slavery along with other sociopolitical reforms of the day.

From early on, GES condemned the importation of American slave products, especially Britain's duplicity by accepting Southern cotton, yet, refusing free-grown US corn during times of famine. 1841 figures claimed the British cotton industry yearly bought 500 million pounds of raw material with the majority American slave-grown, employing some 1.5 million people and earning investors some 50 million in capital. Charles Lenox Remond of the American Anti-Slavery Society accused British mercantile and manufacturing of perpetuating Southern slavery, which relied on cotton exportation profits. British abolitionists certainly agreed. By 1860 more than eighty percent of imported cotton for British industry came from America. Britain, according to American Samuel J. May, directly reinforced "the culture of cotton" in the United States, which remained a main prop of slavery.¹⁰⁶

Scotch complicity was likewise evident. According to Garrison, Scotland's "unusual degree of prosperity" was linked with Southern cotton, yet poor working Scots suffered.¹⁰⁷ The Scottish textile industry dominated manufacturing well into the nineteenth century with cotton reigning supreme, especially in the 1830s and 1840s. Early links forged between British Bahamians providing sea-island cottonseed to Southern Americans who,

¹⁰⁵ James Brown, *Biographical Sketches of the Hon. The Lord Provosts of Glasgow, 1833-83* (Glasgow, 1883), p. 18, GES, *Seventh Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1841), p.8, -----, *Sixth Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1840), pp. 1-10, *GESMB*, pp. 133-135 (2 August 1838), *Memoirs and portraits of one hundred Glasgow men* (Glasgow, 1886), pp. 99-102, *Oliver & Boyd's Edinburgh Almanac* (Edinburgh, 1857), pp. 629-630, *Post Office Glasgow Directory for 1863, 1864*, XXXVI (Glasgow, 1863), pp. 77-78, *Scotsman*, "House of Commons" (24 April 1844)

¹⁰⁶ BFASS, *Minutes of the Proceedings of the General Anti-Slavery Convention* (London, 1840), p. 11, *Christianity versus slavery*, pp. 9-43, London Emancipation Committee, *Proceedings of an Anti-Slavery Meeting* (London, 1859), p. 18

¹⁰⁷ GES, *Report of the Speeches, and Reception of the American Delegates* (Glasgow, 1840), p. 19

in turn, sold the final product to demanding Glasgow merchants. Contemporary historians, like Alexander Whitelaw, attributed British supplies of American cotton directly with Glaswegian merchants. To facilitate British manufacturing demands, Glasgow houses established branches in Charleston and New Orleans. Well into the nineteenth century, Glasgow became the chief seat of the cotton trade in Britain, garnering vast supplies from America with vigor.¹⁰⁸ During the mid-thirties, around 134 cotton mills existed in Scotland; manufacturers in and around Glasgow alone producing roughly one fifth of British cotton output. Glaswegian cotton mill manager James Montgomery suggested that Southern cotton price and “very superior” quality, especially from New Orleans, underpinned its appeal to British manufacturers. In 1832, he determined American cotton was already being imported in “great quantities...estimated at upwards of 230,000,000 lbs. yearly, and apparently still increasing.” A few years later Montgomery superintended the York Manufacturing Company in Maine, USA. His recruitment suggested Glasgow cotton manufacturing was indeed a leader in the business.¹⁰⁹

An American visitor in the 1840s complimented Glasgow’s rank in the top three British towns for wealth, commerce and manufacturing; mostly derived from its extensive cotton production that consumed “an immense quantity of American cotton.”¹¹⁰ By the 1850s, the London Statistical Society determined American cotton was preferred by manufacturers, including those in Glasgow, over “free” Indian produce.¹¹¹ No longer the leading Scottish industry, cotton manufacturing remained a considerable influence. During the “Cotton Famine” imports virtually ceased from 172,055 cwt. to a measly 7216 cwt, which had a knock-on effect to cotton exports (down one-third), job losses and closures.¹¹² American Northerners blockaded Southern ports, yet, Confederate planters withheld cotton in an attempt to force Britain’s hand. One local paper, the *Dumfries Standard*, chided the South’s “failure of their far-fetched device to make us fight the North for them under the flag of ‘King Cotton.’”¹¹³ Although large firms stock-piled cotton prior to the Civil War,

¹⁰⁸ Alexander Whitelaw, ed., *The Popular Encyclopedia* (Glasgow, 1841), p. 469

¹⁰⁹ James Cleland, *Statistical Facts Descriptive of the Former and Present State of Glasgow* (Glasgow, 1837), p. 15, James Montgomery, *The Theory and Practice of Cotton Spinning*, Second ed. (Glasgow, 1833), pp. 277-81, 324-26, David J. Jeremy, “Montgomery, James (1794–1880),” *ODNB* (Oxford, 2004) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/39066

¹¹⁰ J. Jay Smith, *A Summer's Jaunt across the Water* (Philadelphia, 1846), p. 213

¹¹¹ J. T. Danson, “On the Existing Connection between American Slavery and the British Cotton Manufacture,” *Journal of the Statistical Society of London* 20, 20:1 (May, 1857), p. 7

¹¹² W. O. Henderson, *The Lancashire Cotton Famine* (Manchester, 1934), pp. 119-31—Chapter 6 reference the “Scottish Cotton Famine, 1862-65.”

¹¹³ *Dumfries Standard*, “King Cotton” (6 November 1861)

continuing normal manufacturing levels, the loss of Southern slave-grown produce devastated Scotland's cotton industry.¹¹⁴

Scottish and America brethren—transatlantic bonds of faith

Similar to the economic growth of tobacco and cotton, which highlighted integral ties between the US and Scots, religion was yet another significant facet of those relations. Andrew Hook claimed the Church of Scotland held more in common with large, influential sections of Americans than the Church of England; two generations of Scottish revival helping to solidify the continuity of Scottish-American relations before and after the Revolution.¹¹⁵ In the aftermath of the first Great Awakening, Scottish-American identity became reinforced within the colonial Presbyterian Church under a consolidated Scots leadership adopting Old World customs and codes of discipline. Likewise the effect of the “Common Sense Conviction” on early American evangelical thought is significant. Studies show that Scottish philosophy dominated American political and religious beliefs during the Revolutionary era, continuing its impact beyond the Civil War, with Common Sense continuing to broadly influence evangelicals.¹¹⁶

From the late 1820s onward, Scotland's Dissenters looked to America for vindication of the Voluntary principle. Major Scottish ministers (William Anderson, Hugh Heugh, William Kidston, and Ralph Wardlaw) promoted the disestablishment principle based on the US model for Church and State, heightening interest in American church bodies, which precipitated additional ministerial interaction between the two countries. Protestant America, on the other hand, still maintained traditional respect for the Church of Scotland, holding several of their divines, especially Thomas Chalmers, in high esteem.¹¹⁷ Reoccurring American revival activity continued well into the nineteenth century engrossing Scottish clerical and lay alike—a hot topic of discussion within the denominations but also in the press. Concurrent evangelical awakenings in both countries furthered religious dialect and interest in the US system and spiritual ideas, especially “new revivalism,” which melded traditional Presbyterian thought with new concepts of Arminianism, a fundamental aspect of the modern American abolitionist movement. The

¹¹⁴ Botsford, *Scotland and the American Civil War*, I, pp. 133-226, 391-452

¹¹⁵ Andrew Hook, *Scotland and America* (Glasgow, 1975), pp. 14-15

¹¹⁶ Ned Landsman, *Scotland and its first American colony* (Princeton, 1985), pp. 227-255, Mark A. Noll, “Common Sense Traditions and American Evangelical Thought”, *American Quarterly*, 37:2 (Summer, 1985), pp. 217-219

¹¹⁷ J. F. Maclear, “The Idea of ‘American Protestantism’ and British Nonconformity, 1829-1840”, *Journal of British Studies*, 21:1 (Autumn, 1981), pp. 68-89

following analysis of Scottish-American ecclesiastical ties aims to highlight the various religious connections that existed before and during the anti-slavery period, which had varied bearing on the abolitionist movement in Scotland, particularly Glasgow.

Scottish revivals of the eighteenth century were part of a wider transatlantic phenomenon between Britain and America.¹¹⁸ In central New Jersey, early eighteenth century revival activity led by Scotsmen aimed at promoting Presbyterianism through the unification of Scots and their native traditions. This was not the first incursion of Old World influence, though. Since the 1730s, the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge was commissioned by various colonial entities (Boston, Georgia, New England, and New York) in need of missionaries to Christianize the native Indians. Funds were raised through the Church of Scotland's General Assembly and local parish collections to subsidize the missionary work with Indians. During the eighteenth century, the SSPCK fulfilled numerous requests in North America, expanding their influence to Carolina, Connecticut, Delaware, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Rhode Island and Virginia. Georgian trustees, representing a considerable number of Highland emigrants, also requested a Gaelic speaking Presbyterian minister from Scotland.¹¹⁹

By 1739, when the English evangelist George Whitefield arrived, the movement broadened into a general awakening that attracted diverse denominations and ethnic groups under the umbrella of evangelicalism. American cleric Thomas Prince, who later founded the *Christian History* in response to the revivals, was amazed: "I saw a great number of people, consisting of Christians of all denominations, some Jews, and a few, I believe, that had no religion at all."¹²⁰ Whitefield's teachings also touched on the issue of slavery, with particular warning directed at the inhabitants of Maryland, South Carolina and Virginia. Whitefield wrote to the Southern colonies to remonstrate with them about the treatment of slaves and warn them of God's vengeance.¹²¹ Events in America caught the attention of British Christians. In Scotland, Scottish ecclesiasts were routinely informed about religious events in the new world, with particular reference to New England. Rev. John McLaurin of Glasgow corresponded with Rev. Cooper of Boston over revival activity. The Scottish revivalist John Gillies's 1754 *Remarkable Periods of the Success of the*

¹¹⁸ Richard Carwardine, *Transatlantic Revivalism* (Milton Keynes, 1978), pp. 3-56, D. E. Meek, "Revivals," in *DSCHT*, pp. 711-718

¹¹⁹ SSPCK, "Proceedings of the Society, in America, under the first patent," *An account of the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge* (Edinburgh, 1774), pp. 13-19

¹²⁰ Thomas Prince, *An Account of the Revival of Religion in Boston* (Boston, 1823), p. 42

¹²¹ Fladeland, *Men and Brothers*, p. 12

Gospel utilised over thirty narratives and charted revivals in Georgia, New England and New Jersey. In particular, the increase in emigrants to North America further encouraged the placement of colonial Presbyterian ministers.¹²²

Simultaneous Scottish revivals in Cambuslang, Kilsyth and other congregations embraced similar orthodox customs, reinstating many traditional Presbyterian ceremonies. Early revivals led by Seceders, those representing Ebenezer Erskine and the Associate Presbytery, were markedly evangelical in nature and attracted large followings in Southern Scotland. They identified strongly with the early stages of the American Awakening and often utilised colonial revival narratives to motivate the crowds.¹²³ In 1742, though, Church of Scotland ministers led the second wave of revivals, which spread from Cambuslang into the neighbouring areas of Calder, Cumbernauld, Kilsyth, as well as North and North East Glasgow. Whitefield, an integral figure in the colonial movement, visited Scotland twice between 1741-42. Initially invited by the Seceders, Whitefield's visit remained divisive; his refusal to address Secession-only groups led to his denunciation by Erskine and his associates. The CoS capitalised on the English evangelist's success in America to regain and consolidate existing membership, utilizing the revivalist spirit to stop the spread of secession. Nonetheless, both the secessionists and the Kirk maintained religious connections, solidifying Scottish-American spiritual networks.¹²⁴

Rev. John Hamilton from Barony parish, adjoining Glasgow, hoped that Whitefield's "most assiduous fervent" preaching was similarly successful amongst the Scots. Kilsyth minister, Rev. James Robe, noted that events in Scotland paralleled "the very same Appearances accompanying such an Effusion of the Holy Spirit in some of our American Colonies."¹²⁵ Rev. William McCulloch, Cambuslang, believed America would lead religious reform, citing American Jonathan Edwards and biblical authority when proclaiming, "West before East...the glorious Revival of Religion, and the wide and diffusive spread of vital Christianity, the later Times of the Gospel, should begin in the more westerly parts and proceed to these most easterly."¹²⁶ Boston resident Prince, who praised the Church of Scotland "for her found doctrines and pious spirit expressed in the

¹²² Frank Lambert, *Inventing the "Great Awakening"* (Princeton, 1999), pp. 174-176, Meek, "Revivals," p. 713, Thomas Prince, *The Christian History* (Boston, 1744), pp. 3-8, 77-80

¹²³ Landsman, *Scotland and its first American colony*, pp. 232-241

¹²⁴ Michael J. Crawford, "New England and the Scottish Religious Revivals of 1742", *American Presbyterians*, 69:1 (Spring 1991), pp. 23-32

¹²⁵ Prince, *Christian History*, pp. 3-8, 77-80

¹²⁶ Crawford, "New England and the Scottish Religious Revivals of 1742," p. 29, Jonathan Edwards, *The works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed., Edward Hickman, I (London, 1839), p. cxv

writings of her eminent Divines, has been ever dear to New England,” also welcomed revival accounts from the old country, publishing various correspondence between Scottish and American clergymen. During the period of the Cambuslang revivals, Prince received intelligence from Robe and Hamilton.¹²⁷

The first awakening directly influenced Scottish-American identity. After 1740, the Scottish Presbyterian distinction was indiscriminately applied to most colonial settlers from Scotland, including natives of Ulster and the progeny of Scots and English marriages. Religious identity was further altered when the initial Scottish evangelical movement became a Presbyterian crusade. Scottish revivalist religion, although dominated by Scotsmen, drew other ethnic communities; descent no longer became the principal marker for inclusion. Although there was an initial break amongst American Presbyterians over the acceptance of Whitefield—George Gillespie, a native of Glasgow, refused to accept any English influence and severed ties with Gilbert and William Tennent, prominent evangelical leaders within the revival. Reconciliation of the “Old Side” of Philadelphia and the “New Side” of New York helped create a more unified Scottish faction within the church, which adopted customs and a code of discipline reminiscent of the Church of Scotland. This was in part due to the Scotch Presbyterian Society, an influential Scottish minority group that seceded from the “New” congregation to form the more traditional Scotch Presbyterian Church. In 1742, the Scottish evangelical party courted Gilbert Tennent, intending to replicate the American experience.¹²⁸

John Witherspoon of Paisley, an establishment evangelical, was recruited in 1768 to head the New Jersey College at Princeton, originally founded through donations by the Church of Scotland and responsible for training ministers. His arrival and assumption as the titular head of the Presbyterian church, further reinforced Scottish authority through the Synod’s adoption of a Scottish form of discipline; the repelling of further incursions by “New England theology” (associated with Jonathan Edwards, former head of the College); and by introducing of a Scottish curriculum at Princeton.¹²⁹

¹²⁷ Prince, *The Christian History*, pp. 3-8, 77-80

¹²⁸ Crawford, “New England and the Scottish Religious Revivals of 1742”, pp. 25-26, Joyce Goodfriend, “Scots and Schism: the New York City Presbyterian Church in the 1750s”, in *Nation and Province in the First British Empire*, ed. Landsman, pp. 221-244, 249-251
Landsman, *Scotland and its first American colony*, pp. 249-255

¹²⁹ James Grahame, *The history of the United States of North America* (Boston, 1845), pp. 168-169, Landsman, *Scotland and its first American colony*, pp. 242-255, William W. Sweet, *Religion in the development of American culture* (New York, 1952), pp. 10-13

Dr. Witherspoon arrived in America, but by his talents, reputation, and exertions, the college was soon raised to a state of great prosperity...Dr. Witherspoon introduced all the modern improvements of Europe, and incorporated with the course of instruction a sound and rational metaphysics, equally removed from the doctrines of fatality and contingency. Under his auspices, most of the American clergy were educated; and the United States owe to him many of their most distinguished patriots and legislators.¹³⁰

In 1833, one contemporary American historian accredited Witherspoon with “a remarkable revival of religion” at Princeton between 1770-1773, in which “a considerable majority of all the students became deeply affected with a concern for their eternal well-being.”¹³¹

Benjamin Franklin, who assisted in negotiations to bring Witherspoon to the colonies, was instrumental in securing several Scottish doctorates of Divinity for certain American figures. Apparently the prestige that accompanied a British honorary degree attracted several American ministers, who preferred the Scots title versus that of the English Cambridge and Oxford universities, in light of their link with the Church of England. Through his friendship with Principal William Robertson of Edinburgh, Franklin applied in 1765 on behalf of Ezra Stiles, later Yale President, who petitioned the SSPCK for funding to educate and train Negro missionaries, Bristol Yamma and John Quamine, for work in Africa. Within two years Franklin further requested degrees for Samuel Cooper of Boston, future Harvard trustee, and two clergymen. During that same period, a Harvard graduate, Mather Byles, was awarded an Honorary D.D. by King’s College, Aberdeen, based on a recommendation from Franklin. Other Americans gained divinity degrees through their own personal connections with Scotland, as with Princeton President Dr. Samuel Finley, who was honoured with a D.D. from Glasgow University in 1763. Finley was also remembered for his role in the first American awakening, working alongside the Tennents and Whitefield.¹³² In the nineteenth century, American ecclesiastical colleges reciprocated the favour by bestowing several doctorates of divinity on Scottish clergymen.¹³³

¹³⁰ *Statistical Accounts of Scotland, 1791-1845* (<http://stat-acc-scot.edina.ac.uk>), Account 1834-45, Yester, County of Handington, II, pp. 159-160

¹³¹ *American Quarterly Register*, “History of the Revivals of Religion, from the Settlement of the country to the present time,” V (February 1833), pp. 210-218

¹³² Hook, *Scotland and America*, p. 26, SSPCK, “Proceedings of the Society, in America,” p. 19, *Panoplist*, “Biography: The Life of Dr. Samuel Finley,” 1:7 (December, 1805), pp. 281-286

¹³³ William L. Alexander, *Memories of the Life and Writings of Ralph Wardlaw* (Edinburgh, 1856), p. 193, W. G. Blaikie, “Ewing, Greville (1767–1841),” rev. David Huddleston, *ODNB* (Oxford, 2004) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9018, John R. McIntosh, “Dick, John (1764–1833),” *ODNB* (Oxford, 2004) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7594

This may have also reflected the “Common Sense Conviction” impulse, which held widespread currency within early American religious thought. By the 1750s, Francis Hutcheson’s moral philosophy had penetrated major colonial academic institutions. It was introduced at Harvard and the College of William and Mary, and taught by Francis Alison, Scottish immigrant, at the College of Philadelphia. Witherspoon furthered Common Sense thinking by injecting Hutcheson’s beliefs into the Princeton prospectus.¹³⁴ During the Revolutionary period, around 1763-1815, Scottish Common Sense dominated American intellectual thought and broadly influenced evangelicals, Presbyterians especially embraced the concepts most heartedly—different aspects of Common Sense utilised for different purposes by various parties within the denomination. One study of antebellum Southern ministers illustrated the significant contribution of Scottish philosophy to the “rational orthodoxy” of the region’s elite evangelists: Episcopalian, Methodist, Baptist and Presbyterian. Within the New England area, dominant Congregational circles also incorporated Common Sense thought. For American evangelicals, the works of Hutcheson, Thomas Reid, James Beattie, Dugald Stewart, and James Oswald held a significant degree of influence even after the Civil War, especially in regards to Charles Grandison Finney, a New School Presbyterian theologian.¹³⁵

The transfer of Scottish religious traditions also contributed substantially to the perceived, and very real, character of the Scottish-American spiritual identity. During the seventeenth century Quakers and Presbyterians settled in New Jersey and South Carolina, while approximately 1,700 Covenanters were forcibly transported in the Restoration era. By mid-eighteenth century substantial numbers of Scots were emigrating westward, establishing communities in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, as well those already begun in NY and SC—in some cases whole congregations left. The Established and Secession Churches in Scotland supplied ministers throughout the colonial and postcolonial era. The Presbytery in Philadelphia was formed under the guidance of Francis Makemie, a University of Glasgow graduate, its membership growth in 1706 due, in part, to the influx of Scots and Scotch-Irish. Likewise, the Secession churches responded to demands for clerics in America. In 1753 the first Anti-Burgher missionaries left; a decade later the Associate Synod provided clergy; by 1782 a united Associated Reformed Church

¹³⁴ Mark A. Noll, “Common Sense Traditions and American Evangelical Thought,” *American Quarterly*, 37:2 (Summer, 1985), pp. 221-222, Landsman, *Scotland and its first American colony*, pp. 251-255

¹³⁵ Carwardine, *Revivalism*, p. 97 (fn32), Noll, “Common Sense Traditions,” pp. 218-220. E. Brooks Holifield conducted the study.

sponsored ministers and funded supplementary associate churches.¹³⁶ The Anti-Burgher Synod of Scotland, in particular, was known for providing staunchly traditional missionaries. One such cleric, Alexander Gellatly, founded the Presbytery of Pennsylvania and was later recruited by the Scotch Presbyterian Society in New York to inject Scottish traditional customs and discipline into the newly formed congregation.¹³⁷

Edwards was an integral part of the continuing Scottish-American revivalist experience. The New England Congregationalist's defence of traditional Calvinism, revival promotion and theological viewpoints gained lasting notoriety amongst Scotland's evangelicals. Edwards was offered ministerial positions and throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth century, Scottish publishers matched New Englanders in reprinting several editions of his works.¹³⁸ Long after Cambuslang, the American minister kept in contact with several Scottish ministers: John Erskine of Kirkintilloch; Thomas Gillespie of Carnock; William McCulloch of Hamilton; John McLaurin of Glasgow; James Robe of Kilsyth; and John Willison of Dundee.¹³⁹ The young Erskine, later Dr. Erskine of Edinburgh, utilised this correspondence whilst fashioning his union of prayer in 1784, over two decades after Edwards passed away. Erskine's appeal included a reprinted version of Edwards's "A Humble Attempt to Secure Explicit Agreement and Visible Union of God's People," forwarded onto other noted British clerics. While Edwards belatedly emerged as a central religious figure in America's Second Great Awakening, he remained significant within Scottish evangelical circles that reprinted many of his writings.¹⁴⁰

By 1792, the second wave of revivals in Scotland, as well as around Britain, had begun in earnest based on Edwards's original union of prayer concept. His reinvention as a founding father of America's emerging evangelically inspired benevolent empire, certainly helped solidify this link. The early part of the second revival phase was vital to converting William Wilberforce and other notable anti-slavery advocates, leading to an upsurge in evangelism, missionary enterprises and social action. America mirrored events in Scotland, their revivals coinciding time-wise with those in Britain and by creating their

¹³⁶ Marjory Harper, "Emigration", *DSCHT*, pp. 289-292, Clifton E. Olmstead, *History of religion in the United States* (Englewood Cliffs, 1960), pp. 144-154

¹³⁷ Goodfriend, "Scots and Schism," p. 234

¹³⁸ Mark A. Noll, "Jonathan Edwards," *DSCHT*, p. 286, Richard Sher, *The Enlightenment & the Book* (Chicago, 2006)

¹³⁹ Grahame, *United States*, pp. 327-328 (fn2), Edwards, *The works of Jonathan Edwards*, I, p. cxiv

¹⁴⁰ Joseph Conforti, "The Invention of the Great Awakening, 1795-1842", *Early American Literature*, 26:2 (1991), pp. 107-108, Crawford, "New England and the Scottish Religious Revivals of 1742," p. 29, J. Edwin Orr, "Revival and Social Change", *Fides et Historia*, 6:2 (1974), pp. 1-12

own “Concert for Prayer” in 1795. Both countries likewise witnessed resurgence in anti-slavery activity and cohesive transatlantic cooperation against the slave trade, indicating evangelical activity was patently key to cause.¹⁴¹

By early nineteenth century, the American movement caused concern amongst traditionalists due to its “new measures” and unorthodox preaching, involving theological alterations and congregational expansion. The Old Calvinists backed Yale President Timothy Dwight (Edwards’s grandson), who attempted to stem infidel aspects associated with revivals and restore respectable traditionalist customs. Their theology promoted public morality as a response to particular sociopolitical problems. Dwight’s pupil Asahel Nettleton and Leonard Woods, Professor of Theology at Andover, both espoused the Moderate viewpoint that encouraged revivalist activity as long as it adhered to traditional doctrine. Scottish interest in American spiritual events intensified over this new controversy. Fact-finding meetings abroad dominated Nettleton’s travels. Religious conservatives, both clerics and laymen, were dismayed at reports about anxious seats and other unorthodox methods used. Nettleton, loyal to the Calvinist theology of Edwardsian inspired New Divinity, was keen to distance himself and the New England ministerial elite from association with “new measures”—his preaching in both Edinburgh and Glasgow reaffirmed orthodox concepts of a guilty humanity at the mercy of God’s vengeance. Nettleton was concerned that Scots had lost confidence in US revivals, especially due to revival activity associated with Finney.¹⁴²

Much of the hullabaloo was generated by English traveller reports. Mrs. Trollope assailed American revivals as impolite, impure and fanatic. One particularly sensitive issue was the involvement of women in mixed-sex prayer meetings. Trollope “felt sick with horror” recalling what she viewed as the exploitation of women. An English clergyman travelling through the States lambasted anxious seats and sermons “artfully contrived to stimulate the feelings of ignorant people.”¹⁴³ Americans themselves entered into the fray to influence religious opinion in Scotland. Calvin Colton was well-known within Scottish ecclesiastical and lay circles. Unlike Trollope, he promoted US revivals, including reports of those utilising the “new measures.” Colton, another student during Dwight’s Yale days

¹⁴¹ Joseph Conforti, *Jonathan Edwards, Religious Tradition, & American Culture* (Chapel Hill, 1995), p. 9, Orr, “Revival and Social Change,” pp. 3-5

¹⁴² Bennet Tyler, ed., *Memoir of the Life and Character of Rev. Asahel Nettleton* (Hartford, 1853), pp. 190-193, 331-332, Carwardine, *Revivalism*, pp. 95-96

¹⁴³ Frances Trollope, *Domestic Manners of the Americans* (London, 1832), pp. 74-81, 124-128, 167-175, 210-212, Tyler, *Asahel Nettleton*, pp. 190-191. Quoted from Nettleton’s facsimile.

and an Andover Seminary pupil, toured Britain in the 1820s to defend revivalism, religious Voluntaryism and American ideals, in general. Many Scots had read his book with mixed results: some encouraged by the spread of Christianity through revivals, others dismayed by the novel approaches to conversion. Scottish Congregationalist Rev. Wardlaw kept abreast of transatlantic revivals through his American contacts, delighting in their progress, albeit wary of “excitation.” In Glasgow, Nettleton found his hosts disapproving of the anxious seat, as described by Trollope and Colton, which reminded them of English Methodist and Ranters’ practices.¹⁴⁴

Nettleton and other New Divinity men, devotees of Edwards, wanted to reconcile Calvinism with personal moral accountability, yet enforced stricter doctrines, which were less popular than their co-revivalists. New Divinity, otherwise known as Consistent Calvinism, was important to the initial New England phase of the Second Great Awakening; however, Edwards’s theology and Calvinism in general alienated the masses. The concept of Arminianism, the doctrine of free will, which required temporal freedom to act, superseded orthodox Calvinist thought based on predestination—man was by nature sinful, unable to insure his own salvation. This expression of religious liberalism also manifested itself as a popular trend amongst the people—Freewill Baptists, Methodists and other radical Christians, who rejected Calvinism altogether, encouraging converts to self-manage in religious matters.¹⁴⁵

By the 1820s, American Nathaniel William Taylor and his associates at Yale further developed Arminian philosophy, combining Calvinist and Newtonian worldviews with Enlightened rationalism and Reformed revivalism. The New Haven theology completely rebutted the Edwardsean idea of God’s sovereignty—sin as means of good (Old Calvinist)—instead embracing the assertion of human free agency in moral decisions. Nathaniel William Taylor insisted,

Moral agency implies free agency—the power of choice—the power to choose morally wrong as well as morally right, under every possible influence to prevent such choice or action. Moral agency and of course moral beings can

¹⁴⁴ Alexander, *Ralph Wardlaw*, pp. 346-348, James D. Bratt, “Religious Anti-Revivalism in Antebellum America,” *Journal of the Early Republic*, 24:1 (Spring, 2004), pp. 65-105, Tyler, *Asahel Nettleton*, pp. 191-192

¹⁴⁵ Randall Herbert Balmer, *Encyclopedia of Evangelism* (Louisville, 2002), pp. 404-405, William R. Sutton, “Benevolent Calvinism and the Moral Government of God: the Influence of Nathaniel W. Taylor on Revivalism in the Second Great Awakening,” *Religion & American Culture*, 2:1 (Winter, 1992), pp. 23-47

no more exist without this power, than matter can exist without solidity and extension, or a triangle without sides and angles.¹⁴⁶

Another American, Charles Grandison Finney, a New York lawyer turned cleric, also espoused the Arminian stance on personal salvation. Finney, although a Presbyterian by choice, introduced certain Methodist new measures, which were influential on Calvinist audiences in the Northeast and helped evangelist preachers attract substantial new members. His message of a doomed and lost humanity that held the power to influence their own salvation remained fairly orthodox, but his methods and new measures were not. Finney-inspired revivals were markedly unruly and unacceptable to more traditional Calvinists. Both Taylor and Finney's viewpoints provoked outrage amongst conservatives concerned with modifications to traditional Calvinism, especially those against flamboyant and eccentric revival activity, which figured prominently in the American Presbyterian Church divisions of 1837.¹⁴⁷

American New Divinity Congregationalists and Old Presbyterian worthies combined their efforts to repudiate Taylor and Finney's doctrines. In 1832, Presbyterian Dr. William Buell Sprague produced *Lectures on Revivals of Religion*, attempting to consolidate moderate revivalist opinion against the new measures. Sprague's American edition included an essay by Dr. Woods of Andover, who attacked both Taylor and Finney in public and in private correspondence with his Scottish contacts. Woods, a traditional Calvinist and life-long friend of Dr. Wardlaw, sternly criticized Finney's theological opinion, especially that concerning moral agency and free will.¹⁴⁸

Prominent Scottish divines also concurred with Woods against Taylor and Finney's Arminian inspired rhetoric. In the 1830s, Glasgow witnessed revival activity reminiscent of Edwards's Union of Prayer concept, organized by eminent local ministers motivated by revivalist activities in America. The more conservative ecclesiasts, including Rev. Drs. Henderson, Hugh Heugh, John Mitchell, and Wardlaw, who conducted solemn devotional meetings based on prayer, scriptural education and ministerial counseling, firmly rejected any connection to ideas espoused by Taylor or Finney. Heugh campaigned and lectured on the subject to the United Associate Synod in response to heightened interest in the

¹⁴⁶ Taylor quoted in Sutton's, "Benevolent Calvinism," pp. 25-26, 32-34

¹⁴⁷ Curtis D. Johnson, "'Sectarian Nation': Religious Diversity in Antebellum America," *OAH Magazine of History*, 22:1 (January, 2008), pp. 14-18, Sutton, "Benevolent Calvinism," pp. 31-34

¹⁴⁸ Bratt, "Religious Anti-Revivalism in Antebellum America," pp. 82-82, William Buell Sprague, *Lectures on Revivals of Religion* (Glasgow, 1832), Leonard Woods, *Letters to Rev. Nathaniel W. Taylor* (Andover, 1830), p. 8

American Awakenings. In his *Address on the Revival of Religion*, he invoked the lineage of Edwards, calling for a religious revival to facilitate the “spread and ascendancy [of Christianity]—that countries professedly Christian are to be truly evangelized.” His enthusiasm was tempered, however, firmly cautioning against excited feeling, protracted meetings, the infusion of false opinion, and immediate conversion. Heugh denounced American and British revivals that used methods linked with Finney, later objecting to the usage of “Revivalist” as a term denoting an enthusiast or zealot.¹⁴⁹

Dr. Wardlaw embraced the concept, partly due to its popularity in Scotland. Despite applauding the American experience, he agreed with Woods’s repudiation of Taylor’s New Haven theology and Finney-like events, known for their eccentric displays.¹⁵⁰ Glasgow’s more conservative religious community joined the chorus of Dr. Sprague, Woods and other American notables who denounced recent Finney-led revivals in Rochester, NY. A Scottish edition of Sprague’s lectures, reprinted Woods’s rebuttal of the New Measures and included an introduction by revered Dissenting British minister, John Angell James, who questioned Finney and Taylor’s theology. James concurred with leading Scottish clerics who criticized stateside awakenings, referring also to Colton’s work and the opinion of the American Presbyterian Church, which condemned the more extravagant and irregular revivals as injurious to transatlantic revivalist practices.¹⁵¹ Taylor and Finney’s ideas may have alienated mainstream orthodox ecclesiasts, but their views increasingly garnered popularity amongst the masses. Taylor’s free agency concept accentuated the element of moderate Calvinist revivalism that stressed the importance of acquiescing to divine order through the fulfillment of Christian duty through social obligations. The result was the profusion of voluntary reform associations: Bible and tract societies, Sunday schools and missionary efforts, including those focusing on moral improvement, like temperance.

American Presbygational circles (the Plan of Union between Presbyterian and Congregational churches in 1801) that promoted doctrinal innovations associated with the New Haven theology and later further developed by Finney, cultivated anti-slavery principles during the nineteenth century. Leaders of the American anti-slavery movement—Arthur and Lewis Tappan, Joshua Leavitt, Theodore Dwight Weld, as well as

¹⁴⁹ Glasgow Society for the Promotion of the Revival of Religion, *Union of Prayer*, dated 27 April 1830 (GUL Archives), Hamilton MacGill, *Life of Hugh Heugh* (Edinburgh, 1852), pp. 327-329, 528-529

¹⁵⁰ Alexander, *Ralph Wardlaw*, pp. 273-276, 346-348

¹⁵¹ Sprague, *Lectures*, pp. lvii-xcii

Scottish native Captain Charles Stuart—all participated in Finney’s religious endeavors. Although Finney himself often urged caution in abolition methods, he consistently preached against the institution of slavery. It is important to remember, though, that the relationship between religious revivals and evangelical attitudes to black slavery were complex and, at times, conflicting. The conversion experiences of the abolitionists mentioned, including James Birney and William Lloyd Garrison, were particular to America; much of the language and persuasive techniques of 1830s anti-slavery paralleled revival meetings.¹⁵² The importance of New Haven theology and Finney’s influence on American abolitionist thought is crucial to understanding the 1840s divisions in US and Scottish anti-slavery. Previous Scottish abolition history tends to generalize the Arminian influences of Taylor and Finney as part of a wider evangelical experience, which is erroneous considering several prominent anti-slavery ministers disavowed this theology.

From the 1830s onwards, revivals spread throughout the Scottish industrial belt, Renfrewshire, mid-Ayrshire, mid-Fife and North-eastern outposts like Dundee and Aberdeen, many of the labouring poor turning to evangelical religion. Along with other American revival accounts, Finney’s *Lectures* were widely circulated throughout Scotland. Finney’s *Memoirs* described the “wall of prejudice” that surrounded the Evangelical Union Church of Scotland, founded by those espousing Finney’s doctrines, yet, rejected by Scottish Congregational and Presbyterian churches. The principal founder of the EU, James Morison, and others had been suspended from the USC for promoting Arminianism, linked with Finney, and other unorthodox beliefs. Another original member, Fergus Ferguson, was one of nine students expelled from the Congregationalist-run Glasgow Theological Academy for “heretical tendencies” linked with the Morisonian controversy. Glaswegian Congregationalists, on the whole, were divided—five local churches withdrawing fellowship from several others who espoused the new doctrines. The Relief and Free Churches also endured defections. This uncompromising stance was a hallmark of Scottish orthodox Calvinist views, versus the more lenient attitudes of the English, who did not witness the same schisms concerning Finney’s theological influence. Chalmers

¹⁵² Gilbert Barnes, *The Antislavery Impulse 1830-1844* (New York, 1933), pp. 3-28, Carwardine, *Revivalism*, pp. 42-44, C. G. Finney, *Memoirs of Charles Grandison Finney* (New York, 1876), pp. 320-333, John L. Hammond, “Revival Religion and Anti-Slavery Politics,” *American Sociological Review*, 39:2 April, 1974), pp. 175-186

feared orthodox American preachers were being corrupted, stating, “Error flies very swiftly in the atmosphere of this sinning world.”¹⁵³

Another converging area of controversy in Scottish religious life that incorporated American ideals was the Voluntary Church movement. In 1828 the Test and Corporation Acts were repealed, granting full civil and political rights to Protestant Dissenters. Following the Catholic Relief Act of 1829, albeit conferring only limited political rights, Irish Catholics joined Dissenters and various radical thinkers to challenge the predominance of an Established church. Glaswegian UPC minister Andrew Marshall believed voluntary religion was more virtuous and beneficial, whereas Establishment churches were inherently corrupted by their cooperative relationship with the state, which selected one Church for privileges and endowments, while forcing non-members of that Church to contribute to its support.¹⁵⁴ Prior to this, Scots refused to support a church and state separation, propounded by English Dissenters; *Tait’s* remarking how the “cautious Scotsman” had belatedly joined the fight against established churches. The list of prominent ministers of the Glasgow Voluntary Church Association included Rev. Drs. John Dick, Greville Ewing, Heugh, and Wardlaw, all of who received Doctorates of Divinity from their US connections. With their familiarity of American ecclesiastical institutions, it made sense for them to employ the stateside example in debates, much to the enmity of their opponents.¹⁵⁵

The Glasgow Voluntary Church Association was officially founded in 1832, amidst the reform bill agitation. By March 1833 the Glasgow society had established the monthly *Voluntary Church Magazine*, which debated with the *Church of Scotland Magazine* over the merits of the American system. As with revival accounts, visiting Americans were queried about the voluntary support system for US churches. Amherst President Herman Humphrey was invited to one such social occasion, commenting,

Respecting the practical operation of the voluntary principle, they had many questions to ask; and they seemed extremely gratified with the facts which I

¹⁵³ Alexander, *Ralph Wardlaw*, pp. 421-426, Carwardine, *Revivalism*, pp. 96-101, Samuel Hanson Cox, *Interviews: Memorable and Useful* (New York, 1853), p. 133, Finney, *Memoirs*, pp. 455-458, -----, *Lectures on the Revivals of Religion* (New York, 1835)

¹⁵⁴ Stewart J. Brown, “The Ten Years’ Conflict and the Disruption of 1843”, in *Scotland in the age of the Disruption*, eds., Fry and Stewart (Edinburgh, 1993), pp. 3-5

¹⁵⁵ *Tait’s*, “The Church is in Danger,” 2 (October 1832-March 1833), pp. 242-243, Charles Grey, *A national Church vindicated* (London, 1835)

was enabled to state on the subject...the 'Voluntaries' were prepared to make the most they could, of our great and successful experiment.¹⁵⁶

Wardlaw, the foremost Voluntary advocate, found the stateside experience valuable and requested further information from his contacts, invariably utilized against disparaging anti-voluntary tracts. Establishment ministers also employed American know-how. Chalmers scrutinized his transatlantic brethren, arguing against the system's practicality for Scotland, while John Gordon Lorimer, member of the Glasgow Association for Promoting the Interests of the Church of Scotland, penned *The Past and Present Condition of Religion and Morality in the United States of America*, which utilized damaging accounts written by eminent American clerics as to the failure of the model. The issue of US church complicity in slavery likewise undermined the Voluntary cause. Rev. Cunningham exposed the *faux pas* in the foreword to *Picture of Slavery in the United States of America*, as did Lorimer. Scottish Voluntaries eventually abandoned their predilection for the US model of church and state, unable to reconcile their anti-slavery beliefs with the inconsistency of American Christian collusion with slavery.¹⁵⁷

After the Disruption in 1843, Chalmers and fellow Free Church ecclesiasts received widespread sympathy in the United States, garnering significant financial contributions from various denominations, some tied with slaveholding. Despite America's penchant for the voluntary church system, the Free Church's split from the Church of Scotland was invariably viewed as a vindication of this principle and it was the respect for their religious divines that commanding much of the support. Rev. Drs. Candlish, Chalmers and Cunningham attracted particular attention, their authority on religious matters weighed heavily in America, especially during the slavery debates. Both anti-slavery and apologist clerics deferred to the Scotch authority, long regarded as orthodox divines.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁶ Herman Humphrey, *Great Britain, France and Belgium* (New York, 1838), p. 117

¹⁵⁷ Alexander, *Ralph Wardlaw*, pp. 273-276, 346-348, George Bourne, *Picture of Slavery in the United States of America* (Glasgow, 1835), Cox, *Interviews*, pp. 52-55, J. F. Maclear, "The Idea of 'American Protestantism' and British Nonconformity, 1829-1840," *Journal of British Studies*, 21:1 (Autumn, 1981), pp. 75-77, John Gordon Lorimer, *The Past and Present Condition of Religion and Morality in the United States of America* (Glasgow, 1833)

¹⁵⁸ Alexander, *Ralph Wardlaw*, p. 275, Jonathan Blanchard and Nathan Lewis Rice, *A Debate on Slavery* (Cincinnati, 1846), pp. 220-241, 268, 280, 376, David Christy, *Pulpit politics* (Cincinnati, 1962), pp. 879-882, Cox, *Interviews*, pp. 47-50, GES, *The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and the Rev. Dr. Chalmers, on Christian fellowship with slaveholders* (Glasgow, 1845), Charles K. Whipple and Samuel J. May, *Relation of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to slavery* (Boston, 1861), p. 44

Of the Dissenters, Anderson, Heugh and Wardlaw gained varying degrees of notoriety in American religious circles. Anderson consistently drew the attention of US visitors for his straight-talking speeches, especially those concerning the Voluntary principle. During the 1830s, Heugh's renown extended stateside and he was honored with a Doctorate of Divinity from the University of Pittsburgh. He toured Europe with several American colleagues in the 1840s, who mourned his untimely death.¹⁵⁹ Wardlaw's fame eclipsed that of his fellow Dissenters and rivaled Chalmers. US travelers making pilgrimages to the old country generally sought out "the two masters of Scottish theology, Wardlaw and Chalmers."¹⁶⁰ By 1816, his theological perspectives were sought from abroad. New England clergy hailed his rigorous refutation of Unitarianism, reprinting several editions of his comment on the Socinian controversy; his support for infant baptism; and other noteworthy topics of religious discussion. After receiving his D.D. from Yale, Wardlaw became the solitary Scottish corresponding member to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, remaining a life-long member.¹⁶¹

Anderson, Candlish, Chalmers, Cunningham, Heugh and Wardlaw represented only a fraction of the ministerial connections between Scotland and America, which were not only extensive but also quite intricate in nature. This familiarity proved significant in the slavery controversies from the 1830s onward. Anti-slavery remonstrances sent stateside by the major Scottish Dissenting churches often touched upon this relationship, alluding to their shared ecclesiastical history and similarity in doctrinal attitudes. More importantly, though, the addresses demonstrated the reverence Scots held for their American brethren and institutions, which, at times, inferred a sense of sympathy in relation to their struggles against the slaveholding influence within the church. Steadfast abolitionists accused the United Associate Synod's address of being mild-mannered and the Congregational Union of Scotland of strengthening "the hands of the pro-slavery party in America."¹⁶² The Free

¹⁵⁹ Henry Marten Baird, *The life of the Rev. Robert Baird* (New York, 1866), pp. 209-210, George Blair, *Biographic and Descriptive Sketches of Glasgow Necropolis* (Glasgow, 1857), p. 278, Humphrey, *Great Britain*, pp. 158-159, Rogers, *A collection*, p. 30

¹⁶⁰ Hogg's, "Biographical Sketches: Dr. Chalmers," 5:127, (31 July 1847), p. 359

¹⁶¹ Alexander, *Ralph Wardlaw*, pp. 150-151, 193, ABCFM, *Report of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions* (Boston, 1846), p. 8, *The American almanac*, XXVI (Boston, 1855), p. 338, Ralph Wardlaw, *Unitarianism incapable of vindication* (Andover, 1817), -----, *A dissertation on the Scriptural authority, nature, and uses, of infant baptism* (Boston, 1832)

¹⁶² ASR, "Appeal to Congregational churches of Great Britain and Ireland" (4 November 1840), pp. 280-282, CUS, *Address of the Congregational Union in Scotland to their fellow Christians in the United States, on the subject of American slavery* (Glasgow, 1840), -----, *Annual Meeting of the Congregational Union of Scotland--Resolutions of Several Associated Bodies on the Subject of American Slavery* (Glasgow, 1836), SIA, "Resolutions on the Subject of American Slavery," V (November, 1836), pp. 118-120, Rev. A. Somerville, *An Affectionate Expostulation with Christians*

Church of Scotland endured severe censure for its apologist stance in relation to American ministers directly or indirectly linked with slaveholding. The General Assembly of the Free Church rationalized the sin of slaveholding Christians, providing ammunition to US pro-slavery partisans, while publicly rejecting ultra abolitionists.¹⁶³

Yet, across the board, British churches of every denomination were being accused of duplicity, prioritizing Christian union at the expense of the slave. One visitor to the US decried the connection, stating, “I found this brutality, this impiety, indirectly encouraged, because feebly and lukewarmly checked, by many of the churches of Christ in Britain.”¹⁶⁴ Several allegedly anti-slavery ministers in Scotland and America inadvertently and, some, directly, negatively affected the American abolition movement. The 1840 divisions in the American and Scottish anti-slavery ranks were in part due to the impasse concerning Christian communion with slaveholders. Transatlantic brethren maintained and defended their close relations up to the Civil War for the sake of the Gospel and an Evangelical Alliance, and, in many instances, aligning themselves in open opposition to several leaders of the American campaign.

Revolution, Reform and the American Republic

To cut the matter short, we'll begin with our first American war.
Thrushgrove meeting, 29 October 1816¹⁶⁵

Several eighteenth and nineteenth century Scots viewed the American War of Independence not only as a watershed moment—the realization of the slow and steady eradication of their own rights as citizens, both locally and nationally—drawing analogies between Scotland's economic, political and social situation to that of Colonial America. Furthermore, they were inspired by the emerging republic's freedom of religion, informal social order and universal representation. Following 1776, positive spin on the American ideal waxed and waned through decades of further revolutions and wars, although reformers espousing civil and religious liberty persisted. There were distinct differences

in the United States of America, reprinted in *SIA*, X (April, 1837), pp. 221-226, United Associate Synod of the Secession Church, *An address on negro slavery to the Christian Churches in the United States of America* (Edinburgh, 1836)

¹⁶³ Thomas Chalmers, *A Selection from the Correspondence of the late Thomas Chalmers* (New York, 1853), pp. 407-412, Cox, *Interviews*, pp. 57-60, GES, *The American board of commissioners for foreign missions, and the Rev. Dr. Chalmers*

¹⁶⁴ Leitch Ritchie, “Letter to Editor”, in *Slavery in America*, VII, (February, 1837), pp. 182-183

¹⁶⁵ James Turner, *Recollections of James Turner, Esq., of Thrushgrove*, ed., J. Smith (Glasgow, 1854), pp. 20-40

between the manner, mode and rhetoric implied by reforming Scots in relation to the American democratic model: liberals used the US experience as a marker for change, rather than as the blueprint for a new political order; radicals, however, perceived America's egalitarian society and inclusive citizenship as the solution. On the other hand, Conservatives frequently highlighted the failings of the system to undermine Scottish reform efforts, consolidate political power and preserve traditional hierarchical society.¹⁶⁶

When Guilford good our Pilot stood,
 An' did our hellim thrav, man,
 Ae night, at tea, began a plea,
 Within *America*, man:
 Then up they gat the maskin-pat,
 And in the sea did jaw, man:
 An' did nae less, in full Congress,
 Than quite refuse our law, man.
Robert Burns¹⁶⁷

The War of Independence set a precedent in Scottish, as well as British, political discourse. Like others, Burns drew parallels between the American Revolution and periods of resistance in Britain's history. To him the basis for the rebellion mirrored those of the Glorious Revolution, in which British citizens fought against "imposition and oppression...in the very same terms as our forefathers did against the family of Stuart!" In his letter to the editor of the *Edinburgh Evening Courant*, 8 November 1788, he also condemned the Tudors, Yorks and their predecessors as subversive to the "rights of man." 1788 marked the hundredth anniversary of the 1688 Revolution and celebratory events were held around Britain.¹⁶⁸ A few years later, *The Revolution of America* appeared in Edinburgh print asserting the root cause of the colonial resistance was due to the inherited legacy of 1688 that, as the prerogative of the people, secured "English liberty" from oppressive tyrants.¹⁶⁹ James Boswell, who deplored the general support in Scotland for the government, opposed British policy against America as unjust in its violation of their constitutional rights. His 1783 *A Letter to the People of Scotland* chided his countrymen for their apathy in national concerns, lest they dealt directly with their own private interests. Although an avowed Royalist, Boswell warned that, but for the revolution, "The

¹⁶⁶ Alan Rogers, "American Democracy: The View from Scotland, 1776-1832," *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 6:1 (Spring, 1974), pp. 63-71

¹⁶⁷ Robert Burns, *Poems, chiefly in the Scottish Dialect*, II (Edinburgh, 1794), p. 123

¹⁶⁸ Robert Burns, *The Letters of Robert Burns*, ed., J. De Lancey Ferguson, II (Oxford, 1931), pp. 269-271

¹⁶⁹ Abbè Raynal, *The Revolution of America* (Edinburgh, 1782), pp. 9-11

slavery spread over the continent of America, would have reverberated upon Britain.”¹⁷⁰
 George Dempster, Perth MP 1761-1790, consistently reproved the “unhappy dispute with America” as a violation of their natural rights, supporting independence from Britain.¹⁷¹

Ministers from the Church of Scotland also joined in the fray. Rev. John Erskine wrote the highly inflammatory *Shall I go to War with my American Brethren?* which alluded to the civil and religious liberties secured for the people in the 1688 convention, and sought to enlighten the Scottish public, and perhaps the government and king, as to the reasons behind the discord.

Let us excuse our American Brethren, if an honest zeal against what they deem perhaps unreasonable, an encroachment on their natural and unalienable rights...Men only restrained by fear, will cease to submit when they find it in their power to rebel, and will eagerly seize the first opportunity of bursting asunder their galling yoke...Such therefore, who value their own freedom, had need to take care how they drive to extremity the free-born and brave-spirited North Americans. Nothing under God can so much tend to prevent the establishment of despotism in the British empire, as every part of the empire considering it as at once the interest and duty, to guard against the encroachments on the rights of every other part.¹⁷²

Erskine represented a significant number of Evangelical or Popular party ministers and laymen who opposed the war. The Moderates, in general, steadfastly supported the government until atrocities inflicted by British soldiers on innocent civilians in America became glaringly apparent. Boswell rejoiced in the pacifying tone offered by clergy, in light of the conciliatory measures offered by Britain. On 12 February 1778, the public fast day, Rev. William Thom’s sermon reflected the changing mood of the nation stating, “The conquest in America is indeed a grand object, and we are called upon to fast and pray for it; but we pray for many things which are very hurtful to us.”¹⁷³

The stateside rebellion held significant appeal in the Scottish press. A decade prior to conflict, Scotland had around fifty newspapers, the majority published in Edinburgh, although periodicals were also produced in Glasgow, Aberdeen, Dundee, Kelso and

¹⁷⁰ James Boswell, *A Letter to the People of Scotland on the Present State of the Nation* (Edinburgh, 1783), pp. 1-7

¹⁷¹ George Dempster, *Letters of George Dempster to Sir Adam Fergusson* (London, 1934), pp. 85-86, 93-94. Letters to Sir Adam dated 26 January 1775 and 4 February 1778.

¹⁷² John Erskine, *Shall I Go To War With My American Brethren?* (London, 1769), pp. 13-27

¹⁷³ James Boswell, *Letters of James Boswell*, ed. Chauncey Brewster Tinker, II (Oxford, 1924), pp. 274-275, 452-455, Dalphy I. Fagerstrom, “Scottish Opinion of the American Revolution,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, XI (April, 1954), pp. 262-63, William Thom, *Achan's trespass* (Glasgow, 1778), p. 44.

Dumfries. This number rapidly increased in the late 1770s in response to the demand for American news, which took precedence over major domestic issues. Eighteenth century publishers tended towards impartiality in the matter, printing Parliamentary debates as well as rebel literature. On the whole, calls to suppress the rebellion were matched and, at times, offset in the early period by calls for leniency and rationalized reasoning of the war's causes. The Declaration of Independence and the alliance with France, though, caused a backlash in opinion with the *North British Miscellany* reflecting the economic and strategic concerns for the British Empire; while the *Edinburgh Magazine and Review*, along with other papers, lambasted Rev. Erskine's 1769 pamphlet as treasonable. Once Britain sustained heavy losses, Scottish public opinion became disillusioned with government policy, turning to resignation and indifference.¹⁷⁴

It is easy to simplify the public response based on newspaper output. The crux of the matter lay in the amalgamation of Scottish dissent on current domestic issues with events in America before, during and after the war. In fact, those supportive of the Americans, or at least empathetic, shared common strands: hostility to unwarranted taxes; revulsion to corruption in government; and discontent with the unequal representation of the people in the House of Commons—considered by Scots and Americans alike as an attack on their liberties. Boswell upheld the right of Americans to resist taxation without proper representation. Years later he reiterated this stance as an usurpation of British constitutional rights, while decrying attempts by the House of Commons to aggrandize its power through corrupt elections and shady bills, referring to the House of Commons subversive influence in elections (Middlesex controversy) and the East-India bill that threatened the security of private property and gave unprecedented authority to a handful of ministers, respectively. As to the latter complaint, he alluded to opposition in Scotland to the abolishment of heritable jurisdictions as a violation of the Articles of the Union. Boswell urged his fellow countrymen to get involved, “And let Scotland, at the most interesting period since the Restoration, assume the importance to which she is entitled.”¹⁷⁵

Rev. Thom utilized biblical narrative to expose the misconduct of an unjust legislature that misappropriated taxes.¹⁷⁶ Thomas Erskine, who successfully defended Lord George Gordon, another pro-American advocate, blamed the conflict directly on the “abuses and

¹⁷⁴ D. B. Swinfen, “The American Revolution in the Scottish Press,” pp. 66-74. Excerpts from *North British Miscellany* (2:6, 13-19 September 1779) and the *Edinburgh Magazine and Review* (V, 1776) quoted from Swinfen's article.

¹⁷⁵ Boswell, *A Letter to the People of Scotland*, pp. 1-43, -----, *Letters*, II, pp. 213-214, 239

¹⁷⁶ Thom, *Achan's trespass*, pp. 28-32.

corruptions in our own constitution: the very abuses and corruptions which are complained of to this hour.”¹⁷⁷ Another Scot noted that, in consequence of the War of Independence, men of all ranks turned their attention to legislative concerns not previously seen as important, especially that of equal representation in the House of Commons, which safeguarded their liberties.¹⁷⁸

“The spirit of liberty had taken a northern turn”¹⁷⁹ and Scots seemed more inclined to reform endeavors. Dr. Thomas Somerville noted in 1779 “a great change in the sentiments of the nation at large...The discussion of the subject not only engaged the attention of public bodies of men, but became a principle object of conversation in every company.”¹⁸⁰ Erskine, Somerville and other notables who supported the American cause became early adherents of the French Revolution. Erskine, described by one contemporary as a “violent democrat,” defended Thomas Paine *in absentia* (his English trial for treason) and welcomed events in France, asserting, “I think I see something that is rapidly advancing the world to a higher state of civilization and happiness, by the destruction of systems which retarded both.”¹⁸¹ Somerville echoed similar sentiments, hailing the revolution in France as “the dawn of a glorious day of universal liberty.”¹⁸² Archibald Fletcher, a leader in burgh reform of the 1780s, and his wife Eliza sympathized with American colonists. Galvanized into action, he celebrated the fall of the Bastille, supported other liberal causes and voluntarily defended Joseph Gerrard in the sedition trials.¹⁸³

During this period several moderate reform bodies founded: the Glasgow Society for Burgh Reform, Scottish Friends of the People, and United Societies of Paisley associated for Parliamentary Reform, to name but a few. Several Scottish papers, the *Glasgow Courier*, *Glasgow Mercury*, *Caledonian Mercury*, and *Edinburgh Courant*, provided space for the reprinting of their resolutions, reflecting new partisan political debates of the time.

¹⁷⁷ Thomas Erskine, *A view of the causes and consequences of the present war with France*, 12th edition (Edinburgh, 1979), p. 5

¹⁷⁸ Crito, *Letters of Crito, on the Causes, Objects, and Consequences, of the Present War*, 2nd edition (Edinburgh, 1796), p. 103

¹⁷⁹ *CM*, “Letter to Editor” (14 April 1783)

¹⁸⁰ Thomas Somerville, *My own life and times: 1741-1814* (Edinburgh, 1861), pp. 198-199

¹⁸¹ Ned C. Landsman, “Erskine, John (1721–1803),” *ODNB* (Oxford University Press, 2004) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8870

¹⁸² Somerville, *My own life*, p. 264

¹⁸³ Emma Vincent Macleod, “Fletcher, Archibald (1746–1828),” *ODNB* (Oxford, 2004) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9722, Henry W. Meikle, *Scotland and the French Revolution* (London, 1969), pp. 14-19, 49, Jane Rendall, “Friends of Liberty & Virtue: Women Radicals and Transatlantic Correspondence, 1789-1848”, in *Gender and politics in the age of letter-writing*, ed., Caroline Bland and Maire Cross (Aldershot, 2004), p. 77

Thomas Paine's *Rights of Man* was, likewise, still commanded a certain degree of public attention. Abolitionist societies, drawing parallels between the rights of white men to that of enslaved Africans, abounded between 1787 and 1792 in Scotland.¹⁸⁴ In 1791, the Glasgow anti-slavery society, chaired by socialist David Dale, published an address concerning the slave trade that attacked the enslavement of Africans as a violation of human rights. According to the address, slaves were treated indifferently, almost as sub-human, suffering in order to appease Britain's commercial prosperity.¹⁸⁵

The political fervour that superseded American Independence, buoyed by the early stages of the French Revolution and domestic discord, soon came to an end. Reports of violence and mob rule spread like wildfire in the press and disseminated throughout Scotland altering public opinion. With agitation at home involving the disintegration of traditional society and aggressive agricultural transformation, which led to clearances in both the Lowlands and Highlands; and insufficient room for a rising population, driven off into the cities or abroad, uncomfortable parallels were drawn with France. Repressive government acts targeted anyone tainted with dissent. The mainly middle and working class proponents of political and economic reforms were conveniently labeled Jacobins and rebels, charged with encouraging the lower orders to riot. Even seemingly radical periodicals were repressed. James Robertson and Walter Berry, printer and publisher of the *Caledonian Chronicle*, were prosecuted for publishing a revolutionary leaflet. John Mennons of the *Glasgow Advertiser* was indicted for printing radical notice. *Edinburgh Gazetteer* proprietor Adam Scott was indicted for treason, while the previous owner and printer, Captain William Johnston and Simon Drummond, were prosecuted for covering a political trial.¹⁸⁶ The trials of Thomas Hardy, Thomas Muir, and others Scottish reformists attached to Scotland's branch of the radical London Corresponding Society, which advocated universal suffrage and annual parliaments, consistently noted the influence of the American Revolution and Thomas Paine's writings.¹⁸⁷

In 1802 a new generation of Whigs founded the *Edinburgh Review*—Henry Peter

¹⁸⁴ Fagerstrom, "Scottish Opinion of the American Revolution", pp. 252-275, Harris, "Scotland's Newspapers," pp. 42-46, 49 (fn45)

¹⁸⁵ Glasgow Society for the Abolition of the African Slave Trade, *Address to the inhabitants of Glasgow, Paisley, and the neighbourhood, concerning the African Slave Trade* (Glasgow, 1791), taken from a reprint in John Pinford, ed., *The slave trade debate* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 312-329

¹⁸⁶ Michael Fry, *Patronage and Principle* (Aberdeen, 1987), pp. 12-15, Harris, "Scotland's Newspapers," pp. 51-52

¹⁸⁷ William Cobbett, *Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials*, XXIII (London, 1817), pp. 117-238

Brougham, Francis Horner, Francis Jeffrey, James Loch and Sidney Smith. Brougham and Jeffrey both rose to public prominence despite the Tory stranglehold in Edinburgh. Their circle of associates comprised of several liberal notables: John Allen, Henry Cockburn, Archibald Fletcher, Thomas Grahame, and James Moncreiff. One nineteenth century account acknowledged it “was an awful period for those who ventured to maintain liberal opinions...Jacobin, Atheist, Socinian, leveler, incendiary, regicide...any man who breathed a syllable against the senseless bigotry of the two Georges...was shunned as unfit for the relations of social life.”¹⁸⁸ Yet the *ER* men demonstrated considerable admiration for America, in spite of earlier unflattering accounts. Brougham chided the stalwart Tories, like Sir Walter Scott, for not advancing beyond “the times before the flood’ of light which the American War and the French Revolution had let in upon the world.”¹⁸⁹ Jeffrey urged Britain to retain friendly discourse with “the free, powerful, moral, and industrious States of America.”¹⁹⁰

Although careful to uphold traditional ideologies concerning social order—both men opposed outright universal franchise—they advocated several reform causes—anti-slavery being one. Brougham consistently aired his abolitionist views in the *ER* and in Parliamentary debates. Up until the Civil War, he remained an Honourary member of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, presenting several addresses to the Houses on behalf of the committee. Brougham especially deplored American slavery, stating,

We wish well to America, and rejoice in her prosperity, and are delighted to resist the absurd impertinence with which the character of her people is often treated in this country; but *the existence of slavery in America is an atrocious crime, with which no measures can be kept*, for which her situation affords no sort of apology, which makes liberty itself distrusted, and the boast of it

¹⁸⁸ Tristram Clarke, “Thomson, Thomas (1768–1852),” *ODNB* (Oxford, 2004) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27324, W. P. Courtney, “Allen, John (1771–1843),” rev. H. C. G. Matthew, *ODNB* (Oxford, 2004) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/383, A. J. G. Mackay, “Moncreiff, Sir James Wellwood, ninth baronet, Lord Moncreiff (1776–1851),” rev. Michael Fry, *ODNB* (Oxford, 2004) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18948, Karl Miller, “Cockburn, Henry, Lord Cockburn (1779–1854),” *ODNB* (Oxford, 2004) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5771, G. A. Rogers, “Edinburgh Society Seventy Years Ago”, in *Belgravia*, XXXVII (London, 1879), pp. 423–443. Allen, a political and historical writer, taught Horner at Edinburgh, and was known for promoting liberal reform. Cockburn was an author and judge, who advocated church and political reform. Fletcher, a Writer to the Signet, was also an advocate and political reformer. Grahame, judge, supported American independence and was related to Robert Grahame of Whitehill. Moncreiff, advocate, served on the brief ministry of All the Talents, and was known for his liberal views, supporting church and political reform. Rogers’s quote.

¹⁸⁹ Henry P. Brougham, *Historical Sketches of Statesmen Who Flourished in The Time of George III: 2nd series* (London, 1839), p. 79

¹⁹⁰ Henry Cockburn, *Life of Lord Jeffrey*, Second edition (Edinburgh, 1852), p. 247

disgusting.¹⁹¹

As Lord Advocate for Scotland, Jeffrey served on the Edinburgh Anti-Slavery Society committee.¹⁹² Of course, their attitudes to American culture, society and government were not always so enthusiastic; tempered by the ever-present political apprehension of the Dundas era—the moderate political tone helped the *ER* gain a readership that would have been frightened off by a more violent approach. The hot topics meant anything of a political or social nature not in keeping with the Dundas-Tory party. Locally the *Scots Chronicle* and *Gazetteer*, who aggressively promoted Whig opinions, failed from lack of support. Brougham and Horner, though, once came under fire for advocating revolutionary doctrines during debates of the Speculative Society, while they were both students. The seed had been set and it is no wonder they too drew analogies from the War of Independence to their own circumstances, claiming, “In the brilliant perspective of American greatness, we see only pleasing images of associated prosperity and glory to the land in which we live.”¹⁹³ The views expressed in the *ER*, however, irked the more conservative liberals. Men like Walter Scott, who established the rival *Quarterly Review*, opposed broader political reforms, although he supported causes such as Catholic emancipation and gradual abolition.

Organized reform, though, would again resurface in 1816. James Turner of Thrushgrove, a tobacconist of humble lineage, staged a large reform meeting in one of his fields after the authorities refused to grant an assembly at the Trades’ Hall and Glasgow Green. Local papers reported the number of participants at nearly 40,000. Three decades after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, Scots were again invoking the lineage of their forefathers who fought for civil and religious liberty. Like the Scottish bard Burns, several speakers referred to 1688 and the Bill of Rights secured in 1689. Others delved farther into history, recalling the “tomb of martyrs”—Robert Bruce, George Buchanan, John Knox and “the glorious patriot William Wallace.” Drawing direct parallels with the US, one such speaker noted the American Revolution,

Separated the Continent of America from Great Britain and convulsed every part of the empire to its deepest foundations. During the first three years of it

¹⁹¹ Brougham quoted in Macaulay and Cooper, *Negro slavery*, pp. 34-35.

¹⁹² *ASR*, “Scottish Anti-Slavery Meetings,” 4:2 (January 5, 1831), pp. 25-40

¹⁹³ *ER*, “The Complete Works...Dr. Benjamin Franklin,” 8:16 (July, 1806), pp. 327-344, -----, “The Life of George Washington,” 13:25 (October, 1808), p. 170, John Clive, *Scotch Reviewers: The Edinburgh Review* (Harvard, 1957), pp. 31-37, Rogers, “Edinburgh Society Seventy Years Ago,” pp. 426-427, 439

nothing was offered to America but slavery or death. Unconditional submission was the language openly avowed by the ministers of the Crown; and a right to bond and tax American, in all cases whatever, was asserted by a Parliament, in which they had not a single Representative...It was this war therefore, which, like all our succeeding ones, was carried on against the liberties of mankind, that laid the foundation of those burdens which now threaten to overwhelm us.¹⁹⁴

The very same issues of discord thirty years prior—high taxes, rights of citizens, oppressive local government, parliamentary reform, and equal representation—were again resurfacing in Scotland. Although the meeting consisted of mostly working class persons, several gentlemen of the city and country, including some of English decent, attended, believing it was high time steps should be taken to check the general dissatisfaction. Middle-class reformers reprobated the government's spy system and heavy-handed policies used to quash the reform movement in Glasgow.¹⁹⁵ The "Great Thrushgrove Meeting" perhaps was the culmination of further economic and social strife. The wartime sentiments that united Scots as Britons began fading with the pressures of a post-war society. Dissent had already erupted a few years early amongst the Glasgow weavers and following the New Corn Law of 1812, resulted in wage agitation and rioting. It was the collapse of prices, wages and unemployment in the aftermath of the Napoleonic wars that fueled resurgent radicalism. By 1817, the young Whigs, led by Cockburn and Jeffrey, were advocating Burgh reform and, within four months, twenty-eight burghs joined the campaign.¹⁹⁶ Nonetheless, repressive tactics and arbitrary prosecutions continued, coupled with further recession, leading to another wave of riots in 1819, which precipitated the Glasgow uprising of 1820.¹⁹⁷

The events of 1820, culminating in what was dubbed as the "Battle of Bonnymuir," ended with the arbitrary arrests of a number of persons, including Turner. Turner recalled the episode in his journal *Recollections* as a period of "wanton and unjustifiable abuse of power...the rights and liberties of a British subject shamefully violated." He personally disassociated himself from the more aggressive protestations of the leading radicals, John Baird, Andrew Hardie, and James Wilson, all executed for treason, although he did agree with them on aspects of political freedom. Lord Archibald Hamilton, MP for Lanarkshire, appealed to Parliament to address the public uproar in Scotland over the detainment of

¹⁹⁴ Turner, *Recollections*, pp. 20-40

¹⁹⁵ Turner, *Recollections*, pp. 20-40, 86-90

¹⁹⁶ *AJ*, "Burgh Reform," December 10, 1817, *CM*, "Scots Burgh Reform," November 20, 1817, "Burgh Reform," March 16, 1818

¹⁹⁷ *AJ*, "From Glasgow Herald," April 12, 1820, Fry, *Patronage*, pp. 19-24

approximately one hundred persons. Those involved were not working-class radicals agitating on their own without help from the mid-upper classes, Turner's account suggests otherwise. It is well known that Francis Jeffrey and Robert Grahame of Whitehill voluntarily defended the trio without compensation. In *Reminiscences*, Peter Mackenzie recalled Revs. Thomas Chalmers and Ralph Wardlaw lending their influence and public support for the men accused. Certainly this does not prove those higher than the labouring classes participated in the 1820 fiasco, but it suggests that there existed in Scotland a strong public feeling of outrage and concern for personal rights—"The people of Scotland, whose liberties appeared to be at a very low ebb would expect the House to institute some inquiry. If such things were permitted no man was safe."¹⁹⁸

By the 1830s, Baird, Hardie and Wilson joined the list of historical Scottish martyrs, becoming poster boys for the new surge in reform. The *Reformers' Gazette* frequently glorified the trio along with Muir, Hardy, French revolutionaries and, of course, America. The *Gazette* marked the revolution in America as a watershed moment for changing people's perception concerning the aristocracy and government, leading to the demand for reform and extended franchise, declaring, "The Americans established to themselves a government that now stands a model for all the world...the 'Rights of Man' then darted like a meteor across the Channel, through the wide circumference of the British Isles."¹⁹⁹ By 1832, Turner and James Wallace of the Glasgow Political Union had organized a public memorial for Hardy and Baird, alongside a public dinner honouring the Thrushgrove Anniversary. One hundred and twenty gentlemen attended the event, including William Cobbet, which was conspicuously marked by toasts in favour of universal civil and religious liberty, as well as the speedy abolition of slavery.²⁰⁰

What is apparent, though, is that the emancipation of Catholics and the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts procured civil rights for a large group of British citizens. In Glasgow, this was especially important due to the overwhelming numbers of dissenting clergy and laypersons. The now politically enfranchised Dissenters, who were also keen advocates for anti-slavery, buoyed the reform efforts in Scotland. The Scottish Reform Bill of 1832, with its extended representation and enlarged franchise, tipped the scale in favour of the Whigs, who generally espoused various social and political reforms. For

¹⁹⁸ Peter Mackenzie, *Reminiscences of Glasgow*, II (Glasgow, 1865), pp. 161-163, Turner, *Recollections*, pp. 15-20, 47-80

¹⁹⁹ *RG*, "Political Truths," V (29 August 1835), p. 462

²⁰⁰ *RG*, "Monument to Hardy and Baird, Public Dinner, &c," II (3 November 1832), pp. 15-16, 31-35

Glaswegians, it was also a time of greater cooperation between middle-class radical reformers and more moderate leaders of the working class. Anti-slavery advocates William Craig and James Turner, GPU leaders, consistently sought ways to bridge their social and political objectives with that of the local operatives. In turn, the trades often appeared at reformist meetings with flags declaring, “Liberty or Death,” alongside others depicting a half slave, half white face. This new political epoch ushered in the age of “immediate abolition” and the fight against American slavery became paramount in the eyes of so many that looked to the US for ideological and political inspiration. As one Scottish abolitionist observed,

I denounce slavery not only as impolitic and inexpedient not only as inconsistent with the Republican institutions of America...There is much in America, in her laws, her energies, her institutions, which the citizens of every free State, especially of England, are bound to respect; and the land of Washington, and Franklin, and Abbot, and Channing, and Jay, must be dear to every friend of humanity. Our common origin, our common freedom, and, more than all, our common religion, unite us by the strongest and most endearing ties. It is not, therefore, from a dislike to America, but, on the contrary, from feelings of cordial esteem and of brotherly reward, and from a sincere desire to promote her best interests, that we endeavor to awaken her to the guilt and the evils of slavery.²⁰¹

²⁰¹CM, “Public Meeting,” May 21, 1832, “Glasgow Reform Jubilee,” October 1, 1832, EES, *Voice to the United States of America*, p. 20. James Crawford, advocate.

Restraint, Reflection and Reaction

Chapter III

The Glasgow Emancipation Society members and their fellow abolitionists in Scotland inherited a hybrid legacy of political reform and abolitionism, tinged with evangelical impulses, and by the 1830s, half-measures of the past were no longer acceptable to the progressive-minded and, more so, liberal citizens North of the border. The build up to the Reform Bill of Scotland 1832, marked a particularly crucial turning point in the anti-slavery fight, especially in Glasgow. The advent of the second revolution in France, the death of King George IV, and prospects for a new General election, caused “unparalleled excitement” in Scottish politics. Concurrently, the autumn of 1830, accentuated with the infamous declarations by Dr. Andrew Thomson in favour of immediate emancipation for British colonial slaves, marked turning point in the abolition campaign.²⁰² These important sociopolitical events converged alongside religious revivals, and took precedent in Scottish public opinion, while invoking American ideals of equality, liberty and inalienable rights to justify their causes.

In 1833, the year GES formed, pundits were still debating the practicalities of immediate versus gradual emancipation. Peter Borthwick, hired by the West Indian interest, battled it out with George Thompson of the London Agency Anti-Slavery Society in several numerous attended meetings in Glasgow and Edinburgh. According to Whyte, Borthwick’s agenda was in response to the “enthusiasm for immediate abolition.” Rice believed Dr. Thomson’s opinion “did more to push the British movement into its immediatist phase than any other publication.”²⁰³ One has to question, though, the reasons behind the propaganda campaign for immediate abolition if it had by 1830s (allegedly) become common currency in anti-slavery circles. As the leader of the evangelical party in the Church of Scotland, Dr. Thomson’s speech in October 1830 sent shockwaves throughout the anti-slavery community, dividing many long-standing and influential adherents; more importantly, it separated the moderate from the more radical Scots abolitionists. His declaration, which espoused mainstream appeals to religion, justice and “the dearest rights of man,” hit at the crux of the immediate quandary—it advocated instant and total abolition without regard for the consequences.

²⁰² Fry, *Patronage*, p. 27-28; Whyte, *Abolition of Black Slavery*, p. 179

²⁰³ RG, “Slavery” (23 February 1833), Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, p. 23, Whyte, *Abolition of Black Slavery*, p. 230. The series of lectures were held between January and April 1833.

To what purpose is it to say, or what worth or truth is there in the plea, that an instantaneous conclusion, to the slave system would be productive of many serious and extensive mischiefs? Has God any where said that the fear of these will confer on us a right to violate his law? Or does he permit us to put sin into the one scale and advantage into the other, and to decide, in the character of his accountable creatures, according as either preponderates? Is there any rule by which we can compare the one thing with the other? Can disobedience to God be legalised by the gain of the whole world? Or does not Christianity breathe throughout its whole system the spirit of the heathen maxim, which stands as a reproach against many a professing, Christian, *Fiat justitia, ruat coelum?*²⁰⁴

Thomson's rhetoric smacked of absolutism—moral and religious—right and wrong, plain and simple. The violent example of St. Domingo, and more recently Jamaica, provided ample fodder for those timid to the idea of instantaneous emancipation. Thomson dismissed such concerns, claiming,

They talked of the bloodshed and massacre which would ensue; and the brutal treatment they might expect from their emancipated slaves...The argument, in fact, cut its own throat—It was a mere bugbear. They were afraid of shedding a little blood. He would depreciate as much as any man the shedding of blood; but rather that a great deal was shed, if necessary, rather than that 800,000 individuals should remain in the hopeless bondage of West India slavery, which was an infinitely greater evil than all that could be suffered by their opponents...they were no longer to be bamboozled or put off any longer.²⁰⁵

Critics swiftly accused Thomson of advocating a measure “by something like open violence...frenzy.”²⁰⁶ Reports from the meeting itself, reflected disagreement with the Doctor's anti-slavery principles from certain influential committee members and from the audience also.²⁰⁷ Although the London Anti-Slavery Society, Irish reformist Daniel O'Connell and Glasgow Congregationalist Rev. Ralph Wardlaw would come forth to champion immediate emancipation, this occurred in the wake of significant clarification by Thomson. He later insisted his usage of immediate did not denote instantaneous and without due regard. The Edinburgh society, in publishing his speech, clearly wanted to

²⁰⁴ CM, “Negro Slavery” (9 October 1830), Andrew Thomson, *Slavery not Sanctioned, but Condemned by Christianity* (London, 1829), Appendix, pp. 19-24

²⁰⁵ CM, “Negro Slavery” (9 October 1830). The revolution in St. Domingo (later renamed Hayti) began in earnest around 1791 as a result of the French National Assembly bestowing rights of citizenship on free persons of colour, which the white population rejected. The ensuing slave revolts resulted in the death of thousands of white residents and the destruction of hundreds of plantations. By 1794, the National Convention had completely abolished slavery, granting civil and political rights to all black men in the colony. In 1832, Jamaica experienced slave insurrection.

²⁰⁶ *British Colonial Slavery, compared with that of Pagan Antiquity* (London, 1830), pp. 48-52, Andrew Thomson, *Substance of the Speech Delivered at the Meeting of the Edinburgh Society for the Abolition of Slavery* (Edinburgh, 1830)

²⁰⁷ ASR, “Scottish Anti-Slavery Meetings” (5 January 1831), CM, “Negro Slavery” (9 October 1830), Whyte, *Abolition of Black Slavery*, p. 197

vindicate itself of any impropriety, “for the step which they have taken of laying before the public, an outline at least of what may be advanced in support of the immediate abolition of Slavery and of thus advancing the cause of truth, justice, and charity.”²⁰⁸ Following Thomson’s lead, Glasgow “Friends of Negro Emancipation” resolved on 11 November 1830 to promote the “immediate extinction of all slavery, as a violation of the birthright of fellow-men...restore the right...instant liberation.”²⁰⁹

The convoluted nature of immediate emancipation dominated American and British abolitionist thought in the early 1830s, demonstrating that various groups and persons interpreted this ideal in various, sometimes conflicting, ways.²¹⁰ Thomson toned down the aggressive manner of his later speech so as not to alienate the most influential members in Edinburgh anti-slavery circles, gradualists such as Jeffrey and the Lord Provost. The Edinburgh committee likewise distanced itself from any claim to rash action.²¹¹ The situation in Glasgow had similar difficulties—progressive members advocating more stringent, forceful action versus the cautionary reactions of the moderates. GES’s success in the 1830s is partly due to compromises made by various factions within the society, and their fairly uniform belief in the moral and theological righteousness of immediatism.

“Fiat Justitia Ruat Coelum” and the debate between immediatism and gradualism

This particular debate in the history of British, and Scottish anti-slavery, however, is not unique. Just as *Fiat justitia ruat coelum* became a watchword for justice, upholding the right—spiritual and temporal—regardless of possible ramifications, immediate also began appearing in anti-slavery declamations well before the nineteenth century. The two maxims were frequently coupled together and utilized in similar connotations, both demanding instant abolition of slavery and/or the slave trade. Moral philosophers denounced slavery as antithetical to liberty, benevolence and happiness. Evangelicalism further reinforced a sense of urgency with emphasis on Providence, highlighting man’s obligation to absolve himself of earthly sins through redemptive work, such as abolition.²¹²

²⁰⁸ ASR, “Scottish Anti-Slavery Meetings” (5 January 1831), *British Colonial Slavery*, pp. 48-52, Thomson, *Substance of the Speech*

²⁰⁹ ASR, “Scottish Anti-Slavery Meetings” (5 January 1831)

²¹⁰ Davis, “The Emergence of Immediatism,” pp. 209-210

²¹¹ ASR, “Scottish Anti-Slavery Meetings” (5 January 1831), Thomson, *Substance of the speech*, pp. 41-42

²¹² Roger Anstey, “The Pattern of British Abolitionism in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries,” in *Anti-Slavery, Religion, and Reform*, eds. Christine Bolt and Seymour Drescher (Folkstone, 1980), pp. 19-21

In Scotland, this combination found tangible expression, especially during times of reformist activity and revivals.

The 1760 pamphlet of Scottish jurist George Wallace objected to the “institution, so unnatural and so inhuman as that of Slavery, ought to be abolished...Let, therefore, our colonies be ruined, but let us not render so many men miserable.” By declaring slaves, as men, had a natural right to liberty, he dismissed potential obstacles and inferred a sense of immediate moral duty to declare them free. Wallace’s opinion rejected the Chain of Being theory, prevalent during the Enlightenment, used to rationalize enslaving Africans, insisting,

All that inequality, which is to be found among the individuals of human race, is derived from political and arbitrary institutions alone...all inequality, all dependence, all servility, all superiority, all subjection, all pre-eminence...is unnatural...it ought to be destroyed.²¹³

His radical opinions gained little or no recognition in Scotland, yet, influenced American Quaker abolitionist, Anthony Benezet, whose works were read by English anti-slavery advocates Granville Sharp and John Wesley.²¹⁴

In 1776 William Moore wrote an address defending the Americans’ right to rebel based on similar dictates concerning man’s natural right of equality. To this, Moore invoked the maxim of *Fiat justitia ruat coelum*, further stating,

The government of God was a democracy...By nature all men are equal, and in the beginning of the world, there was no degrees of power, nor distinction of names among mankind; and no man ever rose above the rest but by force or consent...Common sense tells us there ought to be no inequality among men...a monarch is not exempt from stench and putrefaction, any more than that of a slave.²¹⁵

Moore did not write a piece concerning Negro slavery, although his concepts of equality and justice resonated in the wake of the American Revolution and often-quoted Declaration of Independence, finding their way into anti-slavery publications. One example of this is a letter by Rev. Robert Boucher Nickolls, Dean of Middleham, who

²¹³ Wallace, *Principles of the law of Scotland*, I, pp. 89-91, 96

²¹⁴ Davis, “New Sidelights,” pp. 585-594

²¹⁵ William Moore, *The addresses for blood and devastation, and the addressers exposed; together with the idolatrous worship of kings and tyrants, and the Americans justified by several precedents* (London, 1776), pp. 1-48

spent many years residency in the West Indies. He denounced slavery and the slave trade as contrary to the principles of common justice, believing the trade should be terminated within the near future, with the aim to eventually abolish slavery in general.

If we admit the plea, from necessity, for such a traffic, where shall we stop? Is not the plea of the robber who is hanged, as good? *Fiat justitia, ruat coelum*. The friends of liberty must, upon their own principles, reprobate this worst species of tyranny: the worst, because no other has so blasting an effect on morals, no other so thoroughly vitiates the heart. The Christian cannot countenance it; his Bible shews him, that “men-stealers” are classed with “murderers of fathers and mothers, and perjured persons.”²¹⁶

Rev. Nickolls’s 1787 letter employs several key themes often used by 1830s abolitionists, including the Glasgow Emancipation Society: abstinence from slave produce, Biblical precedent, Divine Providence, equality, justice, morality and, of course, liberty. To Nickolls, though, allowing slaves access to Christianity was a diverging factor between slavery in the United States versus that in the West Indies; the former provided spiritual guidance that allowed access to God’s salvation, while the latter did not, preferring to keep slaves ignorant of Biblical teachings that conveyed sentiments of equality and liberty.²¹⁷ Eighteenth century anti-slavery comments frequently compared the treatment of American and West Indian slaves—the availability of Christianity, not only to Negroes but also native Indians, made the US system seem tolerable.

To many evangelicals, access to spiritual freedom was paramount to that of temporal freedom. The Scottish Missionary Society of the early 1830s refused to be drawn into the anti-slavery debate, lest it hindered West Indian missionary activity, which was significantly financed by planters. At an Edinburgh anti-slavery meeting in 1832, abolitionist lecturers were assailed by former missionary clergymen and the local press. Anti-abolitionist opposition defended not only prioritizing the Christianization of slaves, but praised their “Christian masters.” However, opinion changed when Scottish Presbyterians missionaries objected to Sunday markets that forced slaves to work on the Sabbath, provoking the ire of the West Indian Legislature.²¹⁸ On the other hand, in the nineteenth century, US slaveholders began systematically withholding Christian education from slaves to keep them ignorant of the same doctrines. When slaves did receive Christian

²¹⁶ Robert B. Nickolls, *A letter to the treasurer of the Society instituted for the purpose of effecting the abolition of the slave trade* (London, 1788), pp. 1-30. The quote is from his original letter in 1787, reprinted in the 1788 edition.

²¹⁷ Nickolls, *A letter to the treasurer*, pp. 28-29

²¹⁸ *Morning Post*, “The Anti-Slavery Agitators Again,” December 12, 1832, *CM*, “Mr. Borthwick’s Lecture,” March 14, 1833. The *Post*’s article was a reprint from the *Edinburgh Evening Post*.

worship, by white clergy only, Biblical excerpts were commonly altered upholding the master's authority and emphasizing obedience.

Several historians agreed that the American Revolutionary period was crucial to Scottish political reform. How it influenced Scottish abolitionist thought is less well-known, but equally deserving of interest. Influential Scots, such as Adam Smith, David Hume, George Dempster, Lord Kames, and William Robertson, in varying degrees, sympathized with the colonists and, not by coincidence, weighed in on the slavery debate also. In Scotland peaks of anti-slavery activity uniformly followed reformist movements, demonstrating a significant link between the two campaigns. Over a decade later, law professor John Millar accredited the decision of the Joseph Knight case in 1778 to "liberal sentiments" in favour of liberty and inalienable rights of man, which prevailed in political discourse from the revolutionary period.²¹⁹

Scottish Presbyterians in the 1770s and 1780s were disposed to republican sentiments, with a minority embracing radical politics. This contrasted with Church of Scotland orthodox members (traditionalists and new evangelicals), who, in general, refrained from the politics of civic humanism. Linking heterodox theology with republicanism, CoS Moderates promoted new moral philosophy as a prudent alternative to the rigid confessional-type Calvinism. Hugh Millar noted,

Our popular struggles have been struggles for the right of worshipping God according to the dictates of our conscience and under the guidance of ministers of our own choice, and...when anxiously employed in finding arguments by which rights so dear to us might be rationally defended, our discovery of the principles of civil liberty was merely a sort of chance-consequence of the search.²²⁰

Scotland also underwent resurgent revival activity influenced by Edwards's original "union of prayer" concept, which influenced several notable British anti-slavery advocates, leading to an upsurge in evangelicalism, missionary enterprises and social action.²²¹ A flagging British missionary movement in Africa and the West Indies was kick-started by

²¹⁹ Quoted from Whyte, *Abolition of Black Slavery*, pp. 59-62.

²²⁰ Mark A. Noll, *America's God* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 66-67. Miller quoted in Mark A. Noll, "The American Revolution and Protestant Evangelicalism," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 23:3 (Winter, 1993), pp. 620-621, Robert Kent Donovan, "The Popular Party of the Church of Scotland and the American Revolution," in *Scotland and the America in the Age of Enlightenment* (Edinburgh, 1990), pp. 81-99.

²²¹ Joseph A. Conforti, *Jonathan Edward, Religious Tradition & American Culture* (Chapel Hill, 1995), p. 9, Orr, "Revival and Social Change," pp. 1-12

anti-slavery appeals. Widespread interest in the campaign helped fund new missions, headed mainly by secession churches, without reliance on state church or colonial elite financing. During this period, British missions outnumbered American operations by 4 to 1, demonstrating a strong initial link between the two causes—anti-slavery and missions. However, this fostered a presumptive relationship between the slaves and missionaries, one that relied on the conversion of the slaves to Christianity as a precursor to freedom, and, in the case of slavery apologists, justified the eternal enslavement of heathens.

Early on, though, anti-slavery reformists questioned the reality of American liberty in relation to Negro slavery, believing little had been achieved.²²² Thomas Day, an English political reformer and supporter of American independence, printed a tract concerning slavery, issuing a scathing analogy of American principles as inconsistent with the institution of slavery.

With what face, Sir, can he who has never respected the rights of nature in another, pretend to claim them in his own favour? How dare the inhabitants of the southern colonies speak of privileges and justice?...If there, be an object truly ridiculous in nature, it is an American patriot, signing resolutions of independency with the one hand, and with the other brandishing a whip over his affrighted slaves. If men would be confident, they must admit all the consequences of their own principles; and you and your countrymen are reduced to the dilemma of either acknowledging the rights of your Negroes, or of surrendering your own.—If there be certain natural and universal rights, as the declarations of your Congress so repeatedly affirm, I wonder how the unfortunate Africans have incurred their forfeiture.—Is it the antiquity, or the virtues, or the great qualities of the English Americans, which constitutes the difference, and entitles them to rights from which they totally exclude more than a fourth part of the species ?—Or do you choose to make use of that argument, which the great Montesquieu has thrown out as the severest ridicule, that they are black, and you white; that you have lank, long hair, while theirs is short and woolly?²²³

Day's tirade was reprinted in several eighteenth and nineteenth century texts—some admirers of America, others not. William Winterbotham admired the achievements of the United States, the Declaration of Independence and new form of government, yet, referring to Day, vowed not to be “blind to their faults.”²²⁴ The *Monthly Review* described Day's assessment of American slavery as “accurate...one of the most complete *argumenta ad*

²²² Nickolls, *A letter to the treasurer*, pp. 28-29, 31

²²³ Thomas Day, *Fragment of an Original Letter on the Slavery of the Negroes* (London, 1785), p. 33-34, Peter Rowland, “Day, Thomas (1748–1789),” *ODNB*, (Oxford, Sept 2004) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7372

²²⁴ William Winterbotham, *An historical, geographical, commercial, and philosophical view of the American United States* (London, 1795), p. 206

hominem we have ever seen.”²²⁵ John Harriott’s travel book, by quoting Day, painted a similar picture of disbelief, although, like many slavery apologists of the nineteenth century, he rejected immediate emancipation on grounds it violated man’s right to property.²²⁶ Decades later American Rev. George Bourne and Englishwoman Francis Trollope would poach Day’s rhetoric to denounce US enslavement of Africans. Bourne’s *Picture of slavery* clearly states,

What hypocrisy and villainy, to profess that we are votaries of liberty, while we encourage or countenance the most ignoble slavery. We cannot form to ourselves an idea of an object more ridiculous, than an American patriot signing the declarations of independence with one hand, and with the other brandishing his whip over his affrighted slave.²²⁷

Trollope’s own version was used to repudiate American ideals of democracy, claiming, “you will see them with one hand hoisting the cap of liberty, and with the other flogging their slaves.”²²⁸

The advent of the French Revolution gave ample fodder to reformers and abolitionists in the struggle for civil rights, Negro and citizen alike. The legacy of the American War of Independence and its bearing on the new French republic’s own *Declaration*, penned by revolutionary the Marquis de Lafayette, renewed interest in the concept that all men were created equal. Hugh Millar claimed Thomas Paine’s *Rights of Man* “shone upon them” and “Liberty and Equality” became the motto of young Scottish Democrats.²²⁹ Anti-slavery societies emerged in Scotland during the initial heyday of French independence alongside several political reform bodies, both causes receiving ample support from the media. In 1792 Scottish minister Niel Douglas, a member of the Edinburgh branch of the Society of Friends, penned a radical document demanding the immediate abolition of the slave trade and a speedy end to slavery, in general, stating,

Perpetual slavery is repugnant to the laws and spirit of the gospel, and to the unalienable rights of man, and inconsistent with the full enjoyment of all happiness which the common Father of all intended for him...the idea of continuing our present slaves and their seed in a state of perpetual servitude, suppose them ever so well treated, appears to me, and I think will to every one

²²⁵ *MR*, LXXI (August, 1784), pp.154-155

²²⁶ John Harriott, *Struggles through life microform* (London, 1807), pp. 26-29

²²⁷ Bourne, *Picture of Slavery*, p. 23

²²⁸ Trollope, *Domestic Manners*, pp. 221-222

²²⁹ Hugh Millar, *Scenes and legends of the North of Scotland*, ed. James Robertson, reprinted edition (Edinburgh, 1994), pp. 456-463

who duly weighs the matter, highly unbecoming a free and professedly Christian people, and subversive of the plainest dictates of natural equality.²³⁰

Douglas credited American independence, as decreed by Providence, for “enlarging the sphere of human liberty,” and, like Nickolls, claimed American slaves were better off than those in the British West Indies, due to the spread of Christianity. The minister chided abolition societies for not addressing those already enslaved, calling “everything short of a measure that will at least ascertain this desirable object in due time is like attempting to skin over a dangerous wound, while the matter is allowed to fester within.” Douglas further declared that slaves, as free men from Africa, had the right to regain their freedom through insurrection, as did those in the St. Domingo.²³¹ The American victory provided a tangible example of God’s judgment, supporting Rev. Douglas’s argument for the immediate abolition of the slave trade (and eventual end of slavery), based on moral and religious principles, while defending the right of those enslaved to revolt.

The Edinburgh Medical Society also issued resolutions declaring, “all men are born free, and equal in their rights,” liberty being the “first and most sacred right of man.” The Society believed slavery, not just the slave trade, was destructive to the progress of civilization in Africa, which degraded the slave to the level of a mere brute and should be abolished.²³² Both the Edinburgh and Glasgow abolition societies issued addresses against the slave trade, which they believed was an affront to Christianity, violating every principle of liberty, humanity, and justice. Neither appealed for the total end of slavery, instead looking to ameliorate slave conditions while firmly rejecting all pro-slavery arguments concerning possible economic forfeiture.²³³ The cautionary stance of Scottish abolitionist societies in the late eighteenth century reflected their low expectations for success. They hoped to achieve some degree of reprieve for slaves through diplomacy, rejecting most radical opinions in order to secure general public opinion; therefore, their petitions explicitly denied any designs to completely end slavery.

On the national front, Wilberforce’s bill for instantly abolishing the slave trade, based on sound policy, as well as principles of humanity, justice and religion, was strenuously

²³⁰ Cobbett, *State Trials*, XXIII, pp. 401-406, John Dow, *Trial of the Rev. Niel Douglas* (Edinburgh, 1817), pp. 1-50, Niel Douglas, *The African Slave Trade* (Edinburgh, 1792), pp. 111-119

²³¹ Douglas, *African Slave Trade*, pp. 1-152

²³² Douglas, *African Slave Trade*, Appendix, pp. 193-195

²³³ Glasgow Society for the Abolition of the African Slave Trade, *Address to the inhabitants*, pp. 1-18, Edinburgh Society for the Abolition of the African Slave Trade, *A Short Address to the People of Scotland on the subject of the Slave Trade* (Edinburgh, 1792), pp. 1-30

espoused by George James Fox and William Pitt. The bill asserted that, "the continuance of the Slave Trade for another hour can be justified on no ground of policy or reason; thinking that its continuance is a direct violation of the principles of justice and of the most sacred obligations of Christianity." The gradualists, championed by Scotsman Henry Dundas, were concerned about Britain's economic and imperial role in the world, which eclipsed their "concern" for the rights of the slave. According to contemporary Thomas Gisborne,

Always ready to adopt some half-measure, something intermediate between right and wrong, and applaud themselves for being persons of moderation...that they had been led by confused expectations of some national benefit to be obtained by the Slave Trade, of some public or private evils to be dreaded from the subversion of a long established system...to make a compromise between God and mommon.²³⁴

Another Scot, William Dickson, toured Scotland in 1792 at the request of Thomas Clarkson. He received mixed results from anti-slavery societies and clergymen, who were wary of promoting immediate abolition of the slave trade. Dickson also advocated the gradual abolition of slavery. The Glasgow Committee was reluctant to follow the appeal to boycott sugar, not because of its intrinsic merits, but due to Clarkson's interest in the controversial French Revolution. On the other hand, Dickson deplored comparisons of British liberty to that of America and France, both countries with pretensions to justice and humanity. Americans, Dickson remarked, "declaimed and contended and fought for what they fondly supposed would be political liberty, held the Africans enchained in that worst species of slavery, personal slavery...have since endeavored to obviate that unanswerable objection to their cause."²³⁵

By the summer of 1792, in light of mob violence in France, anti-slavery adherents and reformers alike were considered dissidents, Jacobins or rebels. In Scotland, Dundas's government crushed any and all reforming impulses, implementing a "general witch-hunt against anyone tainted with dissent."²³⁶ More importantly, though, the maxim *Fiat justitia ruat coelum*, which became common currency in abolitionist circles, was now considered the watchword for "true" Jacobins, those deemed subversive to "peace and order in

²³⁴ Thomas Gisborne, *Remarks on the late decision of the House of Commons respecting the abolition of the Slave Trade* (London, 1792), pp. 7-34

²³⁵ GM, "Letter of Mr. Dickson, on the Slave Trade," 59:2:1 (July, 1789), pp. 621-622, Whyte, *Abolition of Black Slavery*, p. 91, William Dickson, *Letters on Slavery* (London, 1789), pp. 100-101

²³⁶ Fry, *Patronage*, pp. 12-14

society, and due administration of the laws.”²³⁷ The phrase *Fiat justitia ruat coelum* became the mantra for several different causes—political, religious, and social—during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Lord Mansfield’s usage of the maxim during the infamous Somerset case is perhaps the first known link with slavery. In 1790, James Adair’s *Unanswerable arguments against the abolition of the slave trade* described how quickly the phrase became linked with anti-slavery efforts, based on Christian duty and the principles of justice and humanity. Nonetheless, even clergymen became targets of government suspicion for opposing the slave trade or organizing petitions for its abolition.²³⁸ In general, Scottish ministers quickly reverted back to orthodox practices, loyally supporting the government, especially during conflict with France. Church of Scotland clergy and certain dissenting evangelicals disavowed radical politics and republicanism, now interpreted as atheism.²³⁹

By the turn of the century, British travelers were more apt to denounce American pretensions to liberty and equality, than refer to them in relation to abolition. Even the great American hero, George Washington, was not beyond reproach.

It is not without astonishment and regret...whose mind has dwelt with admiration upon the inestimable blessings, of liberty, whilst approaching the residence of that man [Washington] who has distinguished himself so gloriously in its cause. Happy would it have been, if the man who stood forth the champion of a nation contending for its freedom, and whose declaration to the whole world was, "That all men were created equal, and that they were endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, amongst the first of which were life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" happy would it have been, if this man could have been the first to wave all interested views, to liberate his own slaves, and thus convince the people he had fought for, that it was their duty, when they had established their own independence, to give freedom to those whom they had themselves held in bondage!!²⁴⁰

In Parliament, though, the pro-slavery interest continued to flame fears of insurrection and plunder by suggesting abolishing the slave trade would have ruinous effects on the colonies in a similar manner to that of the French Revolution, in effect, “sealing the death

²³⁷ Turner, *Recollections*, pp. 20-40, William Goodell in *Slavery and anti-slavery* (New York, 1855), pp. 129-130, Moses Gomez Pereira, *Circular letter to the corresponding societies, in Great Britain* (London, 1796), pp. 22-24

²³⁸ James Adair, *Unanswerable arguments against the abolition of the slave trade* (London, 1790), William M. Wiecek, “Somerset: Lord Mansfield and the Legitimacy of Slavery in the Anglo-American World,” *University of Chicago Law Review*, 42:1 (Chicago, 1974), p. 102, Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, p. 22

²³⁹ Noll, *America’s God*, p. 66

²⁴⁰ Isaac Weld, *Travels through the States of North America* (London, 1799), pp. 92-95

warrant of every white man in the West-India islands and plantations.” Supporters of the bill, like William Smith, dismissed such arguments as incompatible with the omnipresent dictates of justice, humanity and religion:

The parallel with the negroes of St. Domingo did not hold...for if ever any thing was more disgraceful to human nature than ordinary, it was the conduct of the French settlers in St. Domingo. The conduct of the government, or of its agents, was such, that it might provoke not only uncivilized negroes, but the most patient of Christians to retaliate.²⁴¹

The Irish reformist MP, Sir John Newport, rejected all apologist arguments for supporting slavery, completely denying that removing Africans to the colonies had improved their condition.

If it were even real, was any excuse for taking them away from their own country...the consideration of revenue, trade, and navigation, even if those things were to be affected, should have no weight when put in competition with justice and humanity. It was a traffic which had its foundation in injustice and in blood, and against such an abominable article of commerce, he would ever raise his voice: *fiat justitia ruat coelum*.²⁴²

Once again abolitionist members employed forceful rhetoric that inferred a sense of immediacy in its purpose, very similar to the later campaigns of the 1830s. At this stage, the priority was to abolish the slave trade at a set date in the near future. Pro-slavery interests in government and elsewhere, utilized scare tactics with analogies of anarchy reminiscent of St. Domingo and the French Revolution: uncivilized slaves, just like the French revolutionaries, running amok destabilizing colonial social order; highlighting the planters’ “loss of property” without due compensation; and perceived economic devastation to the mother country, both in terms of loss to businesses and jobs, but also in the overall wealth and prestige of the nation. At times politicians feigned concerned for the slaves, cloaked in seemingly compassionate statutes, such the Dominican Act for the “Encouragement, Protection, and better Government of Slaves,” deemed by the *Eclectic Review* as nothing more than “measures of palliation...A price is still put upon human blood!”²⁴³ These same tactics were repeatedly used by the West Indian interest, and later adopted by supporters of American slavery, to waylay the progress of abolition—firstly, in

²⁴¹ Thomas C. Hansard, *The Parliamentary Debates from the year 1803 to the Present Time*, II (London, 1812), pp. 543-558. The Slave Trade Bill (7 June 1804). The pro-slavery interest remarks are taken from that of Mr. Fuller, Earl Temple and others.

²⁴² Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, p. 548

²⁴³ *EC*, “The Horrors of Negro Slavery; existing in our West Indian Islands,” 2:1 (June 1806), p. 311

terms of the slave trade; secondly, to force the Apprenticeship scheme; and finally, to prolong the inevitable emancipation of the West Indian slaves.

Abolitionists responded by drawing parallels between America's initial efforts to suppress the slave trade within individual states, which helped secure the final passing of the Abolition of the Slave Trade Act in 1807. By mentioning America in relation to the slave trade, abolitionists, like Wilberforce, wanted to demonstrate some initiative on the part of US citizens to eradicate the trade²⁴⁴—one, to quell economic arguments against its abolition based on the foreseen advantage to other nations; and two, to perhaps rally reformists who, in the past, supported the new republic.

The Scottish poet James Grahame, brother of GES President Robert Grahame, wrote in 1809 "Africa Delivered" that praised America and "Benezet's enlightened early zeal."

And blest, Columbia, be thy distant shores!
For they the peal with joy and freedom fraught
Re-echoed, till it reached the coast of blood,
And with redoubled thunder stunned the ear
of Murder as he aimed the fatal blow.
Hail! Africa, to human rights restored!²⁴⁵

James Montgomery, another Scot, was less enthusiastic. His piece lamented Britain's role in the slave trade, stating, it "shared the glory and the guilt, By her were Slavery's island-altars built." Montgomery's abolitionist poetry, touching on themes of Christian benevolence, equality, freedom, and the rights of man, were commonly repeated throughout the nineteenth century movement.

Is he not man, though knowledge never shed
Her quickening beams on his neglected head?
Is he not man, though sweet religion's voice
Ne'er bade the mourner in his God rejoice?
Is he not man, by sin and suffering tried?
Is he not man, for whom the Saviour died?
Belie the Negro's powers:—in headlong will,
Christian! thy brother thou shalt prove him still.
Belie his virtues; since his wrongs began,
His follies and his crimes have stamp't him Man.²⁴⁶

²⁴⁴ William Wilberforce, *A letter on the abolition of the slave trade: addressed to the freeholders and other inhabitants of Yorkshire* (London, 1807), pp. 307-308

²⁴⁵ James Grahame, "Africa Delivered; or, The Slave Trade Abolished," in *Poems on the abolition of the Slave Trade* (London, 1809), pp. 55-100

Yet, complete manumission was not achieved; another seven years would pass before anti-slavery advocates, still cautious of the residual yoke of Dundas's government, regrouped in Edinburgh. Lord Cockburn noted it was the first reform-minded meeting in Scotland since the treason trials of 1793.²⁴⁷ Resurgent radicalism in the first quarter of the nineteenth century—Glasgow weavers wage agitation, New Corn Law riots, and economic collapse following the Napoleonic wars, all spurred new appeals for social and political change.²⁴⁸ In October 1816, James Turner of Thrushgrove, an anti-slavery advocate and GES adherent, allowed reformists to hold a public meeting on his estate in defiance of local Glasgow authorities. Speakers advocating political reform for Scotland drew parallels with the US, stating, “nothing was offered to America but slavery or death. Unconditioned submission was the language openly avowed by the ministers of the Crown.”²⁴⁹ The reformist speakers were not advocating revolution. They were attempting to assert their rights as British citizens and paralleled the American war as a prime example, demonstrating how oppressive actions by government directly led to the loss of the colonies. Even so, according to Turner, their remarks were considered dangerous for the time.

By this period, the *Scotsman* began as a radical publication and throughout the nineteenth century, it consistently printed abolitionist news, as did the *Caledonian Mercury* and the *Glasgow Argus*. The *ER* also vigorously advocated for the abolition of slavery, hailing James Stephen's inflammatory work *The History of Toussaint L'Ouverture*, which sought to dispel myths questioning Negro intelligence and their ability to govern themselves.

The importance of this subject, however, demands a closer scrutiny; for we [*ER*] must be prepared to hear every sort of misrepresentation respecting it from the friends of the trade, who have recently (there is not a doubt of the fact) had the audacity to insinuate, and that in high places, the possibility of reviving it even in this country. It is therefore necessary to seize the first moment for awaking the alarms of the country, and rousing the people to a sense of duty, after the intoxication of success has subsided, and their ears no longer ring with the din of acclamations.²⁵⁰

²⁴⁶ James Montgomery, “The West Indies, a Poem,” in *Poems on the abolition of the Slave Trade* (London 1809), pp. 1-46

²⁴⁷ Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, p. 22

²⁴⁸ James Bulloch and Andrew L. Drummond, *The Scottish Church, 1688-1843* (Edinburgh, 1973), pp. 142-179, Fry, *Patronage*, p. 20

²⁴⁹ Turner, *Recollections*, pp. 20-40, 68-80. The quote, “nothing was offered to America but slavery or death,” was originally written by Joseph Gerald, who, along with his colleague, Thomas Muir of Huntershill, was sentenced to transportation in 1794.

²⁵⁰ *ER*, “Revival of the Slave Trade--Review of The History of Toussaint L'Ouverture. A New Edition,” vol. 23 (April 1814), pp. 131-150, James Stephen, *The History of Toussaint Louverture*, reprinted edition (London, 1814). Stephen originally published this book in 1803.

Stephen's uncompromising anti-slavery beliefs were seen as radical and his credibility was often attacked by the West Indian interest, who branded him a "high-minded fanatic" and "the most learned, bitter, and extreme of anti-slavery pamphleteers."²⁵¹ On the other hand, members of the later Glasgow Emancipation Society, who worked closely with his son, George Stephen, entirely agreed with his beliefs concerning racial equality and hailed him as "the great champion in the Anti-Slavery cause."²⁵²

Amidst the social unrest of the period, even pro-reform abolitionists were arrested and tried for various offences, including those related to the arbitrary Six Acts. James Mylne, Professor of Moral Philosophy at Glasgow University and anti-slavery advocate, was indicted for sedition for allegedly reciting Psalms sung in favour of Bonaparte. Rev. Niel Douglas's 1817 trial for seditious acts stemmed from his denunciations of the King, Parliament and British law. As an advocate of constitutional reform, he deplored the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, allowing reformers to be persecuted without evidence and due process. James Turner was charged with High Treason for his role in the Thrushgrove meeting. That same year, Rev. James McTear was also indicted with treason for allowing disgruntled weavers to use his schoolroom.²⁵³ Andrew Hardie, John Baird and James Wilson, the men executed for treason in 1820, were publicly defended by Francis Jeffrey, Robert Grahame (previously tried for sedition), Ralph Wardlaw and Thomas Chalmers.²⁵⁴ These men, including others, empathized with reformers and supported the anti-slavery cause, in varying degrees.

By 1824, though, abolitionists across Britain had become impatient with legislation that continued slavery, buying time for West Indian planters. In response to the amelioration measures of the preceding year, immediatists published tracts advocating the instant abolition of colonial slavery. *The rights of man, (not Paines,) but the rights of man, in the West Indies* lambasted the "Meliorating Acts to better the condition of the slave, and yet the Slave remains in as bad a condition as ever." The author, Anthropos (pseudo), rejected calls for compensation, instead demanding immediate emancipation for slaves, despite the consequences.

²⁵¹ Lipscomb, "Stephen, James," *ODNB*. Henry Adams and W. L. Mathieson quoted from Lipscomb.

²⁵² GES, *First Annual Report*, p. 11

²⁵³ Dow, *Trial of the Rev. Niel Douglas*, pp. 1-50, GC, "To the Editor" (May 6, 1815), Peter Mackenzie, *An exposure of the spy system pursued in Glasgow* (Glasgow, 1833), pp. 19-21, RG, "Monument to Hardy and Baird, Public Dinner" (November 3, 1832), p. 298, Mackenzie, *Reminiscences*, I, pp. 460-469, Turner, *Recollections*, p. 47-68

²⁵⁴ Mackenzie, *Reminiscences*, I, pp. 151-174, Turner, *Recollections*, p. 15-20

The blessings of FREEDOM, returned as their BIRTHRIGHT, to her disconsolate sons! For myself, I speak freely,--I WOULD NOT LIVE A SLAVE; or if for a time, impatient only for the hour when I might securely break my chain: if I could do it without violence to others, so much the better; if not, FREEDOM IS MY BIRTHRIGHT, in common with that of all men, and FREEDOM I would have! And if any one should have the presumption to oppose my resumption of that right, let him abide the consequence; "his blood be upon his own head."²⁵⁵

Elizabeth Heyrick's *Immediate, not gradual abolition*, like *Anthropos*, was originally printed incognito, perhaps cautious of governmental prosecution. She criticized anti-slavery leaders for countenancing gradual schemes.

The enemies of slavery have hitherto ruined their cause by the senseless cry of *gradual* emancipation. It is marvelous that the *wise* and the *good* should have suffered themselves to have been imposed upon by this wily artifice of the slave holder...the slave holder knew very well that his prey would be secure, so long as the abolitionists could be cajoled into a demand for *gradual* instead of *immediate* abolition.²⁵⁶

Nonetheless, the London Anti-Slavery Society, represented by Thomas Fowell Buxton in Parliament, remained cautious to any immediatist plans, instead insisting on preparatory steps to freedom.²⁵⁷

Heyrick's *Letters*, published two years later, suggested immediate emancipation had attracted a considerable following.²⁵⁸ Parliamentary records during this year support the assertion that immediatism was in the ascent. The Lord Chancellor, John Scott, was concerned that the majority of abolitionist petitions presented to the House "contained an express prayer for the immediate emancipation of the negroes."²⁵⁹ An alarmed West Indian interest immediately began a propaganda campaign against abolition. *Glasgow Courier* editor and native Scotsman, James McQueen, attacked the immediatist camp, not only in the press but also through pamphlets. McQueen attempted to discredit abolitionist's claims to immediate emancipation as "the work of God," employing Biblical references which claimed Christianity "never intermeddled with Civil Government." The

²⁵⁵ *Anthropos*, *The rights of man, (not Paines,) but the rights of man, in the West Indies* (London, 824), pp. 1-47

²⁵⁶ Elizabeth Heyrick, *Immediate, not gradual abolition* (London, 1824), pp. 11-12

²⁵⁷ Thomas Curson Hansard, *The Parliamentary Debates: forming a continuation of the work entitled "The Parliamentary History of England, From the Earliest Period to the Year 1803,"* X (London, 1824), p. 1133. Buxton's speech from 16 March 1824.

²⁵⁸ Elizabeth Heyrick, *Letters on the necessity of a prompt extinction of British colonial slavery* (London, 1826), pp. 141-149

²⁵⁹ Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, XV (London, 1826), pp. 385-396

Glasgow Courier, edited by McQueen, was owned by West Indian proprietors (strongly Tory) and mainly established to counteract the anti-slavery agitation.²⁶⁰ Other apologists invoked comparisons with US slavery arguing, “Many slaves in America regard their lot, compared with their former condition in Africa, as one of the greatest blessing which Providence could confer in them.”²⁶¹

The concept that American slaves were “bettered by being transferred from a heathen land of liberty to a Christian land of slavery”²⁶² was a common justification for US pro-slavery adherents, yet, found analogous strains throughout British gradualist thought. Petitions to ameliorate slave conditions often appealed for “steps in favour of the Negroes as shall civilize and Christianize them, and prepare them eventually for freedom.”²⁶³ Rice acknowledged the link between British anti-slavery and missions; however, viewed the two causes as “more than coincidental...[the] relationship between the two movements was a genuinely symbiotic one.”²⁶⁴ On the other hand, Mary Turner viewed the association as vitally divisive; while abolitionists condemned enslavement, missionary societies “regarded slavery as a manifestation of the mysterious workings of God.”²⁶⁵ Missionary efforts in Scotland focused on mission objectives first—conversion of the slaves, even to the detriment of their freedom. The Scottish Missionary Society’s policy of silence concerning the slavery issue was directly linked to their religious convictions and their dependence on West Indian backing. Missionary William Knibb’s memoir substantiates this, noting that Scottish clerical and public opinion depreciated the existence of slavery, opposing anti-slavery, in particular, due to its conflict with missionary aims. According to Knibb, Scotland, especially Glasgow, “contained some interesting parties, impregnated with pro-slavery sympathies.”²⁶⁶

Evidence suggests that religious bodies promoting Christianizing missions and the West Indian anti-abolitionist campaign held significant sway in Scotland, which submitted fewer petitions in the 1820s than the previous century.²⁶⁷ Some critics rightly accused British

²⁶⁰ *Memoirs and portraits*, p. 200, James McQueen, *The Colonial Controversy* (Glasgow, 1825), pp. 181-183

²⁶¹ *MR*, “Christianity and Slavery,” 21:242 (April, 1826), p. 82

²⁶² *NAR*, “Slavery and the Missouri Question,” 10:1 (January, 1820), pp. 137-167

²⁶³ *MR*, “Review—Stephen on Negro Slavery,” 21:242 (February, 1826), pp. 115-118

²⁶⁴ C. Duncan Rice, “The Missionary Context of the British Anti-Slavery Movement,” in *Slavery and British Society 1776-1846*, ed., James Walvin (London, 1982), pp. 150-163

²⁶⁵ Mary Turner, *Slaves and Missionaries: The Disintegration of Jamaican Slave Society* (London, 1982), pp. 2-9, 22

²⁶⁶ Hinton, *William Knibb*, pp. 158-159, 169

²⁶⁷ Whyte, *Abolition of Black Slavery*, pp. 179-180

religious institutions of colluding with colonial interests, at home and abroad, to maintain the system.

The managers and overseers of the West-Indies, but of our own West-Indian planters, of our West-Indian mortgages, of our West-Indian merchants, who crowd the churches of Bristol, and Liverpool, and Glasgow, as well as London; and who accredit themselves even with evangelical clergymen, by subscribing to churches and chapels, to schools and asylums, to Bible societies, and Missionary societies, a fragment of the profits which are wrung from the Sabbath-less, and God-less Negroes of their plantations, and by the extraction of which their lives are wearing down with fearful rapidity.²⁶⁸

Heyrick's *Letters* also directly charged the ministry and missionaries with apathy and complicity, claiming, "What an imperfect mutilated picture of Christianity is exhibited."²⁶⁹

In 1826 the Glasgow Anti-Slavery Society refused to hold a public meeting "on account of the present agitated and sensitive state of the public mind in Glasgow, occasioned by the unprecedented gloom that has spread itself over its commercial interests and those of the country at large, involving alike the supporters and opponents of the abolition." Although several of its members—Revs. William Anderson, Hugh Heugh, and William Kidston, along with John Murray and William Smeal—would later vigorously champion immediate emancipation, during this period the society remained firmly gradualist "to preserve unimpaired that perfect unanimity." Their petition declared,

That it is expedient to adopt effectual and decisive measures for meliorating the condition of the Slave Population of his Majesty's Colonies. That, through a determined and vigorous, but at the same time judicious and temperate enforcement of such measures, this House looks forward to a progressive improvement in the character of the Slave Population; such as may prepare them for a participation of those civil rights and privileges which are enjoyed by other classes of his Majesty's subjects.²⁷⁰

The 1826 petition alludes to a division of opinion in relation to gradual versus immediate. Revs. Greville Ewing, Heugh, and Kidston supported Scottish missionary activity, which, at that time, conflicted with immediatist aims. More importantly, Rev. Wardlaw's name is absent from the 1826 petition. The Congregationalist minister fervently supported missionary endeavors, devoting several tracts to the cause. His *Responsibility of the*

²⁶⁸ *An Address to Christian Ministers of Every Denomination; also to Religious Professors, who in any way connected with West-Indian Slavery* (Bristol, 1827), pp. 1-3

²⁶⁹ Heyrick, *Letters*, pp. 141-149

²⁷⁰ GH, "Glasgow Anti-Slavery Society," (27 February 1826), "Abolition of Colonial Slavery," (6 March 1826)

Heathen, which touches on the question of equality between different races of man, insisted that heathen slaves must first be Christianized in order to discern between right and wrong.²⁷¹

Nonetheless, 1826 was a banner year for Scottish petitions against West Indian slavery: Aberdeen, Banffshire, Belhaven, Burntsland, Cupar, Dalkieth, Edinburgh, Forfar County, Glasgow, Inverary, King Edward Parish (Aberdeenshire), Kintore, Kirkaldy, Milnethrope, Montrose, and University of Glasgow students. The petition from Glasgow gained particular notoriety for its 38,000 signatures and was disputed in Parliament by pro-slavery adherents. Most petitions appealed for the amelioration and mitigation of slave conditions, which focused on civilizing efforts and Christian teaching, while demanding Parliament enforce the measures of 1823.²⁷² The widespread interest of Heyrick's *Immediate* pamphlet, coinciding with frustration and anger over the failure of the ameliorative agreement, may have prompted the renewal of abolitionist petitioning. Concurrent petitions for Scottish political reform also suggests resurgence in reformist activity equally played a vital role.²⁷³

British reformers could not turn a blind eye to the inconsistency between American democracy and American slavery: "Among the strange anomalies of the age is the existence of Slavery in the United States of America...These deeds are wrought in a land which Washington by his arms, and Franklin by his counsels, have consecrated to freedom!"²⁷⁴ One pro-American Scottish traveler declared,

The averment in the Declaration of Independence that "all men are born free and equal," has been so frequently quoted against the Americans, that it has now become in some measure stale. Apologists for slavery among them may sophisticate as they please, but it is grossly inconsistent with the great charter of the nation; the very essence of which is that bondage in every form, in every degree, and in every circumstance, is repugnant to the plainest principles of reason and of equity. Its existence is a broad and a foul blot on the national character; and this should be unceasingly repeated in their ears, till the stain is washed away.²⁷⁵

²⁷¹ Alexander, *Ralph Wardlaw*, pp. 248-250

²⁷² *CM*, "Abolition of Colonial Slavery" (2, 6, 8, 11, 13, 23, 24, 29 March 1826; 17, 20 April 1826; and 26 May 1826), *GH*, "Glasgow Anti-Slavery" (27 February and 6 March, 1826)

²⁷³ *CM*, "Representation of Edinburgh" (17 April 1826)

²⁷⁴ *MR*, "Slavery in the United States of America," 21:247 (July, 1826), pp. 403-406

²⁷⁵ John Morison Duncan, *Travels through part of the United States and Canada*, II (Glasgow, 1823), pp. 251-252, 324-325

Americans, especially those empathetic to slaves, acknowledged this transgression, which affected their moral and political character abroad. Although they viewed the manner and temper of most foreign writers as pessimistic, there was expectation that British anti-slavery would reciprocally affect American public sentiment.²⁷⁶ Anti-slavery adherents in the US also questioned the inconsistency and, likewise, adopted the maxim long used by British abolitionists, *Fiat justitia ruat coelum*.

The only principles, upon which I consider, that this subject can be treated fairly, are those contained in the scriptures, and (to an American,) those contained in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. To whatever conclusion such an inquiry logically and legitimately leads, I would attach the motto, "*Fiat justitia: ruat coelum*."²⁷⁷

The maxim became the motto of Benjamin Lundy's *Genius of Universal Emancipation*, the publication that launched William Lloyd Garrison's abolitionist career and, similarly, was adopted by the Glasgow Emancipation Society.²⁷⁸ Other than Dr. Thomson's reference to the saying, the Edinburgh Anti-Slavery Society and later Emancipation Society avoided such absolutist rhetoric.

By 1830, reformist activity reached new heights—another revolution in France coinciding with a British General Election and a new monarch (William IV)—people's demands for political change increased dramatically. In Scotland, Dundas's son retired as the more liberal-minded Whigs came to power. Francis Jeffrey and Henry Cockburn became Lord Advocate and Solicitor General respectively, promptly instituting a reform committee to organize proposals for the cabinet. Likewise, membership in radical political unions surged, alongside an increase in organized agitation.²⁷⁹ Abolitionists equally welcomed regime change, declaring,

Now...was the time to appeal to this authority, when we were in the beginning of a new reign, and with the prospect of the immediate convocation of new Parliament, with a number of new members, fresh from the contact of their constituents, and to ask if a case had not been made out calling for its interference?" Nothing had been achieved to ameliorate West Indian

²⁷⁶ NAR, "Slavery and the Missouri Question," pp. 137-140

²⁷⁷ Samuel M. Worchester, *Essays on slavery* (Amherst, 1826), pp. 85-89. The comment was written by a Southern man calling himself "Hieronymus" (pseudo).

²⁷⁸ Benjamin Lundy, *Genius of Universal Emancipation* (Baltimore, 1821-1839), GES, *First Annual Report*, p. 22

²⁷⁹ Fry, *Patronage*, pp. 27-28, -----, "Jeffrey, Lord Francis (1773–1850)," ODNB (Oxford, Sept 2004) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14698

conditions; the slaves remained “not one whip better than they were in 1792.”²⁸⁰

Despite the setbacks, the empty promises and blatant abuses of power by the colonial interest, leaders of the anti-slavery movement in Scotland persisted in their gradualist approach. However, a new attitude began pervading abolitionist thought. The previous year, Dr. Andrew Thomson published *Slavery not sanctioned, but condemned, by Christianity*, in which he proclaimed, “I have no hesitation in professing myself an advocate for the immediate emancipation of slaves.”²⁸¹ Dr. Thomson dismantled the main excuses for upholding the slave system: possible violence, anarchy, and economic loss in the West Indies; bias, ignorance and prejudice towards the Negro race; and, lastly, false Biblical testimony used to justify the enslavement of men. His reasoning drew from his evangelical outlook on temporal freedom, stating there is,

No reason for underrating the temporal freedom with which it is contrasted [with spiritual]. Many are apt to do so. They even go so far as to allege, and to maintain, that the religion of Christ does neither recognize the importance of liberty, nor condemn and prohibit slavery. And thus our highest authority, in all matters of faith and practice, is quoted by those to whom liberty is a matter of indifference, or whose worldly interest is involved in the continuance of slavery, to countenance their opinions and justify their conduct...the first doctrine which revelation impresses on the belief of a Christian is that of the natural equality of our species, as made of one blood, formed into one family, called to one inheritance.²⁸²

In this sense, Thomson dismissed ministerial partiality to conversion, as a precept to emancipation. The privileges of liberty and equality, bestowed by God, included all humans—Christian and non-Christian—regardless of circumstances. Knowing this, Thomson stated, it was the duty of Christians to uphold God’s prerogative in relation to the slave, but also to protect their temporal rights and ensure their own eternal welfare.²⁸³ Simultaneous religious revivalism supported the appeal to Christian duty, demonstrated in selfless acts of benevolence. Doctrinal innovations concerning free will replaced orthodox Calvinist thoughts on predestination. The concept of human free agency, as espoused by Americans Nathaniel William Taylor, and later exploited by Charles Grandison Finney’s new measures, were welcome by the masses in Scotland, although rejected by conservative clergy, some who consistently endorsed anti-slavery efforts. Finney’s inner circle of

²⁸⁰ *CM*, “Negro Slavery” (9 October 1830). Speech by Francis Jeffrey.

²⁸¹ Thomson, *Slavery not sanctioned*, pp. 19-24

²⁸² Thomson, *Slavery not sanctioned*, pp. 1-8

²⁸³ Thomson, *Slavery not sanctioned*, pp. 8-11

revivalists, the New York abolitionists, worked directly with the Glasgow Emancipation Society in the 1830s.

Dr. Thomson's high standing in society, as well as the intrinsic merits of his argument, eventually swayed many Scottish abolitionists over to the immediatist camp.²⁸⁴ His plan for immediate emancipation, along the dictates of *Fiat justitia ruat coelum*, initially proved too radical for the majority of anti-slavery societies in Scotland. In this sense, the demand for immediate abolition did not necessarily mean without delay or preparation. On 6 November 1830, the Glasgow Anti-Slavery Society held a meeting in Rev. William Anderson's Chapel seeking signatures for a petition to Parliament demanding the "speedy and total abolition of slavery." Within the week, the Glasgow "friends of negro emancipation" publicly resolved to advocate the immediate extinction of slavery but left consideration for gradual measures open to the discretion of Parliament. Societies in Aberdeen, Kelso and Perth avoided the term immediate altogether, preferring the earliest time possible for total manumission with full consideration for preparatory measures. In all, the Scots response to Thomson was heart-felt, many acknowledging the need to secure the end of slavery as soon as possible along the dictates of humanity, morality and Christianity, yet, continued along the same gradualist vein as before. Even Edinburgh's petition, quasi-supportive of Thomson's immediatist position, required enactments protecting the safety and property of the white population, as well as providing temporal welfare and moral improvement of the Negroes, prior to emancipation.²⁸⁵

Therefore, the initial excitement over immediate emancipation proved premature. By November one source reported,

A sough went abroad lately that we were to have an Anti-Slavery Meeting, at which Dr. Andrew Thomson was to hold forth; but, behold' the sough has passed away, and here we are, and the House of Lords and Commons know not how we stand with regard to the great question.²⁸⁶

²⁸⁴ Henry B. Stanton, *Sketches of Reforms and Reformers* (New York, 1849), pp. 222-224

²⁸⁵ *AJ*, "Anti-Slavery Meeting" (3 November 1830), *ASR*, "Notices of Anti-Slavery Meetings," 4:2:74 (5 January 1831), pp. 25-40, *CM*, "Edinburgh Society for the Abolition of Negro Slavery" (23 October 1830), *GC*, "Glasgow Anti-Slavery Society" (11 November 1830), *Scotsman*, "Anti-Slavery Meeting" and "Edinburgh Society for Promoting the Abolition of Negro Slavery" (20 October 1830). The appeal also encouraged the participation of ladies, echoing the request of Dr. John Ritchie at the Edinburgh meeting on 8 October 1830, *CM*, "Negro Slavery" (9 October 1830), *Scotsman*, "The Slave Trade" (13 November 1830)

²⁸⁶ *Edinburgh Literary Journal*, "Chit-Chat," 106 (20 November 1830), p. 324

Whyte's analysis of events concluded that immediate abolition petitions dominated those from Scotland during the period of September 1830 to April 1831, although he acknowledged, "there were many that had a gradualist flavour."²⁸⁷ Rice believed Dr. Thomson, "changed the course of the British anti-slavery movement by taking an immediatist position in 1830. Most Edinburgh evangelicals were quick to follow...the first immediatist society in Britain."²⁸⁸ Again, one must question the usage of "immediate" in terms of Scottish abolitionist petitioning for this period. The fact remains that the crux of these petitions still focused on precautionary measures—to protect slaveholders and prepare slaves for freedom. None of them maintained the absolutist tone and rhetoric of Dr. Thomson's 1829 sermon and 1830 objection to gradualist action—immediate emancipation, despite the consequences, *Fiat justitia ruat coelum*. According to his memoir,

With friends of humanity and religion, Dr. Thomson was so far cordially united: the only point on which they differed, and in which he was far ahead of his friends, was that he wished *immediate* emancipation, while they advocated *gradual*: arguing that the slaves were not in a condition for *immediate* liberation.²⁸⁹

Thomson's version of immediatism demanded the immediate cessation of sin—no haggling over compensation, loss of property, improving the slaves, safeguarding the white population—without delay or preparation. Thomson's ideology was indeed ahead of his peers, finding wider application in later absolutist or "ultraist" anti-slavery sentiment. In Britain, the Hibernian Negro's Friend Society lamented the "gradual, limited and temporizing" stance of most British anti-slavery societies and, echoing the words of Thomson, avowed to go farther in principle and action.

Slavery is a state, incapable of graduation or mitigation, in any respect that deserves the name, and that its intrinsic and resulting evils cannot be got rid of, by any means, short of, or distinct from *Abolition*, or prior to its *Extinction*; and we conceive, that to ask for a partial *mitigation*, or gradual *amelioration* of what is evil and sinful,-when our duty is, to ask for a total and instantaneous *cessation*,-would be in itself Sin.²⁹⁰

²⁸⁷ Whyte, *Abolition of Black Slavery*, pp. 202-207

²⁸⁸ Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, p. 38

²⁸⁹ Jean L. Watson, *Life of Andrew Thomson* (Edinburgh, 1882), p. 84

²⁹⁰ Hibernian Negro's Friend Society, *The principles, plans, and objects, of "The Hibernian Negro's Friend Society" contrasted with those of the previously existing "anti-slavery societies"* (Dublin, 1831), pp. 1-16

The Hibernian society wanted to establish a worldwide association against slavery and engage agents to lecture throughout Britain—initiatives embraced by the London Agency Committee. The Hibernian society's viewpoint concerning a universal anti-slavery association appeared well before that of Edinburgh and Glasgow. Hibernian claims that Charles Stuart was originally engaged by themselves and the Birmingham and Caines Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society as an agent to lecture throughout Britain. The Dublin based group also predicted the division between the more moderate LASS and the later Agency Anti-Slavery Society. James Stephen and his supporters espoused immediate and general emancipation, whereas other members upheld the more placating stance of Thomas Fowell Buxton.²⁹¹ George Thompson, the Glasgow Emancipation Society and others fully endorsed Dr. Thomson's argument, leading to early divisions within the London Anti-Slavery Society. Thompson consistently upheld the doctrines of immediatism, as espoused by Dr. Thomson, throughout his career. The more radical members of GES embraced Thomson's version of immediatism, including the maxim *Fiat justitia ruat coelum*, which underpinned later divisions. By 1832, certain members of the LASS split with the original committee, forming their own Agency Anti-Slavery Society dedicated to immediate emancipation. The Agency maintained the system of Colonial Slavery was,

A crime in the sight of God, and ought to be immediately and for ever abolished... and though in some degree mixed up on the one hand with matters of political economy, and on the other with the liberty of the subject, it is important not to abandon the high ground of Christian duty, for the sake of gaining the support of a party, or exacting the applause of a' popular assembly.²⁹²

George Stephen, chairman of the Agency society, praised Dr. Thomson for "one of the most able and efficient speeches that was ever delivered on this subject...made a wonderful impression, even when a thousand Antislavery speeches were yearly made and published." The Agency's published opinion upholding the maxim *Fiat justitia ruat coelum* and gave early accounts of William Lloyd Garrison's criticism of the American Colonization Society. The Glasgow Emancipation Society would later join forces with Stephen and his colleagues in tackling American slavery.²⁹³ In America, Thomson's

²⁹¹ Hibernian Negro's Friend Society, *The principles, plans, and objects*, pp. 1-16, *Scotsman*, "Anti-Slavery Society" (27 October 1832), David Brion Davis, "James Cropper and the British Anti-Slavery Movement, 1823-1833," *Journal of Negro History*, 46:3 (April, 1961), pp. 154-173

²⁹² Agency Society, *Report of the Agency Committee* (London, 1832), pp. 1-22

²⁹³ Agency Society, *To the Anti-Slavery Associations, and the friends of negro emancipation throughout the United Kingdom*, (London, 1834), George Stephen, *Anti-Slavery Recollections* (London, 1854), p. 216, *GESMB*, pp. 23-27 (24 February 1834), pp. 30-33 (20 March 1834),

influence was significant and, during the nineteenth century, was often quoted in US abolitionist publications. Garrison himself adopted an immediatist stance, in part, due to Thomson, commenting,

I cannot portray the absurdity of gradual abolition, and the danger and folly of attempting to mitigate the system of slavery, more strikingly, than by presenting the following eloquent extracts from a speech of the Rev. Dr. Thomson of Edinburgh...*Fiat justitia ruat coelum*. Righteousness, Sir, is the pillar of the universe.²⁹⁴

Following the defeat of the first Reform Bill in 1831, Glaswegian reformers, in particular, lost confidence in William IV and Parliament. Their expectations for victory proved premature. Local reformist literature quickly moved to disassociate themselves and their objectives from the current government. The *Reformers' Gazette*, in particular, now more than before, focused squarely on America as the prototype for the progression of civil liberties in Britain. The Scotch Reform Bill, presented by Jeffrey in July 1831, passed with royal assent a year later, extending the electorate by at least ten-fold and granting Scotland a further eight Parliamentary seats. Under the auspices of Jeffrey and Henry Peter Brougham, the *Edinburgh Review* championed social and political reform, increasingly praising American progress by clearly distancing itself from the Tory party and “ultra-royalists,” stating, “The example of America has already done much for that cause [liberty]; and the very existence of such a country, under such a government, is a tower of strength, and a standard of encouragement, for all who may hereafter have to struggle for the extension of their rights.” But they also equally reproached America’s inconsistency in regards to slavery.²⁹⁵

The success of the Reform Act reinvigorated the Scottish immediatist camp, garnering popular representation of the people, as well an upsurge in those enfranchised, who demanded abolition. British abolitionists, in general, felt “the passing of the Reform Bill will hasten its [slavery’s] destruction.” In 1833, both the Edinburgh and Glasgow Anti-Slavery societies welcomed missionary William Knibb, who supported immediate and total emancipation, and organized large-scale petitions in favour of such—Edinburgh

Agency’s *Tourist*, “Review,” 1:9 (12 November 1832), p. 79, “To the Editor,” 1:11 (26 November 1832), p. 96, “The American Colonization Society,” 1:29 (4 March 1833), pp. 238-239

²⁹⁴ WLG, *Thoughts on African colonization* (Boston, 1832), pp. 78, 87

²⁹⁵ CM, “Abstract of the Scotch Reform Bill,” July 16, 1832, *ER*, “Review of “An appeal from the judgements of Great Britain respecting the United States of America...by Robert Walsh, Esq.,” 33:66 (May, 1820), pp. 395-451, “The Americans and their Detractors,” 55:110 (July 1832), pp. 479-526

garnering 21,291 signatures, while Glasgow returned an overwhelming result of 31,172. Knibb noted the importance of the Reform Bill in bolstering the anti-slavery campaign. The later Edinburgh Emancipation Society also acknowledged the significance, stating, “the Reform Bill passed into law, the people were for the first time really represented, they demanded the abolition of slavery.” Lord Suffield presented the Scottish petitions, claiming the appeals did not mean instantaneous liberty, however, demanded legal restraints to check the “absolute and irresponsible power of the slave master.”²⁹⁶ No doubt Scotland’s increased political clout, both in its inflated Parliamentary and voter base, had knock-on effects for the anti-slavery movement. GES, especially, was dominated by members who equally supported both causes, drawing parallels between their campaign for British civil rights to the plight of slaves.

Staunch political reformers, such as Peter Mackenzie, secretary of the Glasgow Political Union, similarly threw their weight behind the immediatist drive; however, he deliberately refrained from any discourse on American slavery, comparisons often used by conservatives in political and slavery debates. Mackenzie claimed he was “decidedly in favour of Immediate Emancipation” despite alleged consequences, dismissing claims for compensation. He glorified the American Revolution as a watershed moment, which changed people’s perceptions concerning aristocracy and government, believing, “The Americans established to themselves a government that now stands a model for all the world.” His pre-occupation with general suffrage for the masses, especially fighting for the rights of workers, underpinned his rationalization of American liberty versus slavery.²⁹⁷

In Dumfries, Edinburgh and Glasgow, elite gradualists, led by Jeffrey and Lord Moncrieff, supported the American Colonization Society, and rejected the immediate emancipation stance espoused by Garrison and Dr. Thomson. All three cities established Liberian and Colonization societies, both male and female, based on evangelical and philosophical merits. The ACS also received funding from Aberdeen, Dundee and Perth, and was welcomed in Greenock. Resolutions favouring the manumission of American slaves to Liberia and for “civilizing and Christianizing Africa” were passed, while cautioning against interference in US political institutions. Very few Scottish ACS supporters joined

²⁹⁶ CM, “Edinburgh Society for the Abolition of Negro Slavery” (20 October 1832), “Anti-Slavery Society” (19 January 1833), EES, *Voice to the United States of America*, p. 19, Hinton, *William Knibb*, pp. 158-161, 165, *Scotsman*, “Glasgow Anti-Slavery Society” (19 January 1833), *Tourist*, “Address to British Christians Respecting Slavery,” 1:6 (22 October 1832), *Parliamentary Review and Family Magazine*, “House of Lords—March 28,” 1 (London, 1833), pp. 505-508

²⁹⁷ RG, “Slavery” (23 February 1833), pp. 476-478, “Political Truths” (29 August 1835), p. 462

the later Edinburgh and Glasgow Emancipation Societies—partly in defiance of the immediatist agenda, but, more importantly, due to the increasingly radical abolitionist philosophy espoused.²⁹⁸ The *Glasgow Free Press*, originally fairly liberal in sentiment, became politically timid under the editorship of William Bennett and upheld the gradual abolition of slavery, believing it was,

Consistent with the real interests of both the Slave and his Master...not dangerous to the many thousands of Shopkeepers and other Business and Monied Men in this Country, who more or less depend on an extensive Trade with the West Indies.²⁹⁹

In 1832, Glaswegian pseudo-reform candidate Daniel K. Sanford promoted himself as a reforming abolitionist to secure votes, but quickly demonstrated his penchant for more conservative policies. To bolster West Indian gradualist arguments, he attacked the inconsistency of professed American freedom with their homegrown slavery. Sanford chaired the exclusive Glasgow Reform Association, comprised mostly of Clique members, which disbanded after securing rights for themselves and much of the middle class.³⁰⁰

On the other hand, radical reformers united to denounce the ACS, in a manner similar to how they had publicly exposed all electoral candidates not in favour of social and political change. By March 1833, the London Agency and Glasgow Anti-Slavery societies both condemned the ACS for having hoaxed British philanthropists. The Agency declared the ACS a “disgraceful body of men who are now imposing on many benevolent persons in this country.” Likewise, reports claimed GASS was “unusually illiberal in their recent assaults on the Colonization Society.” Ladies in Glasgow, assisted by Anthony Wigham and Rev. William Anderson, formed an auxiliary association to the London Agency society, to promote the immediate and total extinction of slavery throughout the British dominions.³⁰¹

²⁹⁸ *AR*, “Letter” and “Intelligence,” IX (March, 1833), pp. 16-22, 145-146, *Colonizationist*, “British Anti-Slavery” (Boston, 1834), pp. 116-117, 212-213, 292. The Scottish groups supportive of ACS: Aberdeen (Alexander Bannerman, MP and Principal Dewar); Dumfries Liberian Society; Dundee Anti-Slavery Society; Edinburgh ACS Collection Committee (Lord Moncrieff and Henry Cockburn); Edinburgh Ladies’ Liberian Society; Glasgow ACS Collection Committee (Andrew Mitchell, chairman, and Principal Macfarlane); Glasgow Ladies’ ACS Committee (aided by David Nasmith). Both publications reprinted extracts from several Scottish newspapers.

²⁹⁹ *Glasgow Free Press*, “Petition” (12 November 1830), Special Collections (GUL)

³⁰⁰ *AJ*, “Glasgow Reform Association,” October 3, 1832, Daniel K. Sanford, *Speech of Sir Daniel K. Sandford* (Glasgow, 1832), Mackenzie, *Reminiscences*, II, pp. 235-236

³⁰¹ *AR*, “Intelligence” (24 March and 15 April 1833), pp. 145-146, George Thompson, *Substance of an Address to the ladies of Glasgow* (Glasgow, 1833), pp. 1-38, *GC*, “Formation of Ladies’

Nationally, the Agency's *Tourist* infamously published lists of candidates for or against immediate emancipation. In Glasgow, Mackenzie's *Reformers' Gazette* similarly posted notices against "Boroughmongers" or those antagonistic to social and political reform.³⁰² Glasgow candidates advocating broad reform, which included further extension of the franchise to include the working class, as well as favouring immediate emancipation, were generally labeled as Radicals; whereas other reformers, or staunch Whigs, such as Daniel K. Sanford and James Oswald, were satisfied with current electoral conditions and, generally, supported gradual emancipation.

The Glasgow Emancipation Society—independence and initiative

James McCune Smith once recalled that GES secretary John Murray held close ties to George Stephen of the Agency Anti-Slavery Society.³⁰³ Murray's connection explains why GASS and GES worked closely with the London Agency group in the early 1830s. Mirroring the discontent of the Hibernian society, certain Agency Committee individuals endorsed a no-compromise agenda championed by the elder James Stephen, not the cautionary proposals of the moderates, "who had long ranged themselves on the popular side in all political questions, had become so thoroughly imbued with the conviction that diplomacy alone would carry the day, that they were one and all long averse to a bolder policy." Frustrated with Buxton's leadership, which advocated gradualist means for liberating the slaves, Agency members officially separated from LASS mid-1832.³⁰⁴ This attitude resonated with Glasgow abolitionists, who firmly supported immediate and universal emancipation, resolving to cooperate with the Agency committee.³⁰⁵

GES adamantly remained independent of both London societies to ensure their particular course of action was maintained—strict adherence to immediatism, focusing on America as the key to abolishing slavery worldwide, by both civil and religious precedent. Agency committeemen were more than ready to tackle US slavery, demanding immediate emancipation. On the other hand, the older London ASS was reluctant to expose American transgressions. As politicians they were very much aware of the sensitive nature

Association in Glasgow" (8 March 1833), *Tourist*, "Slavery in America," 1:32 (25 March 1833), pp. 263-264, "Meeting for Ladies," 1:41 (13 May 1833)

³⁰² *Tourist*, "Colonial Slavery," 1:2,12 (24 September and 3 December 1832), pp. 16, 104, *RG*, "Boroughmongers" (10 December 1831), pp. 26-27

³⁰³ Smith, "Murray," p. 62

³⁰⁴ Davis, "James Cropper," pp. 166-168, Stephen, *Recollections*, p. 118. Quoted in *Recollections*. Davis disagreed with Stephen's timing of the split but acknowledged divisions centered around the level of action proposed.

³⁰⁵ GES, *First Annual Report*, pp. 11-12, *GESMB*, p. 30 (20 March 20 1834)

of American-British politics, especially during a time of relatively good relations with their transatlantic neighbor. Likewise, they were reluctant to pursue an immediatist agenda when Britons themselves had failed to fully emancipate their own colonial slaves. The Glaswegian abolitionists sought to harness the strengths of both societies, not only to achieve their own anti-slavery goals, but also to preserve well-established anti-slavery synergy.

From an early period, Agency members routinely published information relating to American slavery. The *ASR*, under the guidance of Zachary Macaulay, printed the Irish MP Daniel O’Connell’s scathing attack on the US system—

George Washington! That great and enlightened character—the soldier and the statesman, had but one blot upon his character. He had slaves, and he gave them liberty when he wanted them no longer. Let America, in the fullness of her pride, wave on high her banner of freedom and its blazing stars. I point to her, and say, there is one foul blot upon it—" *You have Negro Slavery*"...America, it is a foul stain upon your character...This conduct, kept up by men who had themselves to struggle for freedom, is doubly unjust. Let them hoist the flag of liberty with the whip and rack on one side, and the star of freedom upon the other...She excuses her conduct, and refers to the British and West India Islands. Nothing, they say, can be wrong, because it is British.³⁰⁶

A conviction long existed that Britain directly contributed to the existence and proliferation of US slavery—both by historical precedent and by example. The LASS was receptive to such ideas, which were aired in the *ASR*, but unwilling to propose any official action on the matter. The *Edinburgh Review* accused English settlers of “succeeding to the rights of the original despoilers of America...that the slave is *the absolute property* of the master.” Others looked to England’s dependency on American cotton as responsible for encouraging the proliferation of American slave plantations. Some British abolitionists bemoaned America’s inheritance of slavery from the Mother country, vowing, “We owed it therefore to America, as well as to ourselves, to put and end to slavery.”³⁰⁷ The *Glasgow Argus* deemed it a moral revolution, once the West Indian colonies were emancipated,

³⁰⁶ *ASR*, “Cork Anti-Slavery Society—Mr. O’Connell,” 3:53 (October, 1829), pp. 94-95. At this time, the *ASR* represented the LASS. Macaulay is listed on the Agency Committee for 1832 prior to its split with LASS—see Agency Society, *Report of the Agency Committee* (London, 1832).

³⁰⁷ *ASR*, “Cork Anti-Slavery Meeting—Mr. Lane,” 3:53 (October, 1829), p. 88, “General Meeting—Mr. O’Connell,” 3:61 (June 1832), p. 261, “Extracts from the *Edinburgh Review* of October 1824,” 3:53, supplement (October, 1829), pp. 105, 119. The opinion concerning cotton was taken from Lane’s speech. American inheritance of British slavery quoted from O’Connell.

slavery would be abolished throughout the world.³⁰⁸ Rev. Wardlaw summarized GES's position on the issue, claiming,

“Am I my brother's keeper?” we looked to America. On the ground of the Trans-Atlantic Slaves owing their origin to Britain, and being kindred blood with ourselves, we looked to America. On the ground of their having derived their very slavery from us, and having had it fostered by our example, we looked to America, and when thus, in common with our brethren in the Northern and Southern Metropolis, we looked to America.³⁰⁹

Even Americans were conscious of British “guilt” for introducing colonial slavery—

Slavery, it is said, is not the fault of America—it was forced upon her by Great Britain, in her state of dependence...In presenting such temptation to the colonies, Great Britain was surely guilty. Of this her philanthropists, at least, are now sensible...[because the] sin of Britain lay in using a moral force to introduce slavery, she is bound to use a moral force to abolish it.³¹⁰

The new Glasgow Emancipation Society prioritized US slavery as their most important field of operation. In their opinion, the system discredited America's prestige as a pioneering democracy and leader of the free world. They also believed that by assisting the downfall of American slavery, enslavement world-wide would cease to exist: “When Slavery expires in America, where shall it survive?...We are bold to reply nowhere, and nohow. The battle fought in Columbia decides for the world.”³¹¹ The preliminary meeting included a diverse mix of individuals—both socially and religiously. Those present included Murray, who read Garrison's *Appeal*, Rev. Dr. Heugh, James Johnston, William Smeal, Sr., Anthony Wigham—all previous GASS members; as well as two Church of Scotland ministers, Rev. John Duncan and Rev. Charles Brown; and staunch reformers William Craig and Rev. McTear.³¹²

The new anti-slavery group had attracted not only loyal, long-standing abolitionists, but also prominent political reformers and religious revivalists. The official inaugural lists shows that at least thirteen former GASS committee members returned, only a fraction of those previously listed, with the biggest loss coming from non-returning clergy. Approximately eleven ministers did not join GES; a few stayed in the gradualist camp and

³⁰⁸ *GA*, “United States,” reprinted in the *Aberdeen Journal* (11 September 1833)

³⁰⁹ *MASS, Fifth annual report* (Boston, 1837), pp. 58-64. GES meeting from June 1836.

³¹⁰ *AASR*, “A Voice from Great Britain to America,” 1:12 (December, 1835), p. 162

³¹¹ GES, *First Annual Report*, pp. 5-6, ----, *Address by the Committee of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, to the Ministers of Religion in particular, and the Friends of Negro Emancipation in general, on American Slavery* (Glasgow, 1836), pp. 1-8, *GESMB*, p. 1 (5 and 7 December 1833)

³¹² *GESMB*, pp. 1-2 (6 December 1833)

supported the ACS, such as Rev. Patrick McFarlane and Dr. John Mitchell. Rev. Kidston, along with newcomers Revs. Charles Brown and Alexander Harvey, were also originally involved with the Glasgow ACS committee, but left to join GES. This list is by no means definite and further research of Glasgow City records and newspapers may clarify and enhance knowledge of the original GASS.³¹³

Adding to the list, six known participants of the Clique, representing the “progressive Reform party” in Glasgow—William Craig, Robert Grahame, John Fleming, Thomas Muir, Andrew McGeorge and Robert Sanderson; of which, Craig and Muir also belonged to the Crow Club, dedicated to more radical middle class reform.³¹⁴ GES’s President, Grahame, was the first post-Reform Bill Lord Provost and descended from a well-known abolitionist family, who supported American Independence and held ties with French revolutionary the Marquis de Lafayette. James Beith, member of the Glasgow Political Union, was considered a radical reformer. As for clerical members, Revs. Anderson and McTear both publicly advocated social and political reform, more so than any other founding GES ministers. Drs. Heugh and Wardlaw backed reform discretely, yet, were keen revivalists, inspired by orthodox American religious revivals. They also championed the Voluntary movement in Scotland, along with Rev. Anderson and other GES laymen.³¹⁵

Research on the Glasgow Emancipation Society took for granted various truisms and tended to downplay the more progressive, reforming aspect of the new society. Whyte viewed the role of Revs. Heugh, King and Wardlaw—all three eminent ministers, as a continuation of the previous GASS; securely focused on evangelical impulses within the group. Wardlaw was singled out as, “perhaps the leading abolitionist in Scotland.”³¹⁶ Although Rice noted the “catholicity of reform” of Scots anti-slavery circles, he believed the long-standing tradition of benevolence and abolitionism underpinned GES, similarly acknowledging a religious partiality.³¹⁷ Bingham perceived the transformation of GASS into GES as a prolongation of pre-existing circumstances: liberal humanitarians unified in support of immediate emancipation, unwilling to relinquish political influence as anti-

³¹³ AR, “Letter,” 9:26 (March, 1834), pp. 21-22, GH, “Abolition of Colonial Slavery” (6 March 1826), *Scotsman*, “The Slave Trade” (13 November 1830), “Glasgow Anti-Slavery Society” (19 January 1833), “Anti-Slavery Society of Glasgow” (17 April 1833)

³¹⁴ John Strang, *Glasgow and its clubs* (Glasgow, 1864), pp. 423-437, 447-462

³¹⁵ Mackenzie, *Reminiscences*, I, pp. 262-266, II, pp. 224-272. According to Mackenzie, Beith, Craig, Fleming, Grahame, MacGeorge, and Muir were conspicuous reformers, during the Reform Bill of Scotland (1832) campaign.

³¹⁶ Whyte, *Abolition of Black Slavery*, p. 226

³¹⁷ Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, pp. 35-41, 46

slavery coalition; likewise, driven by fervent evangelical activity, confirmed by the religious principles of its resolutions and high clerical involvement.³¹⁸ This study concedes these points; however, considers the progressive reformist tendencies of the core members as equally significant to understanding the objectives, principles, and spirit of GES.

Case in point is GES's connection with the Agency society. The London Anti-Slavery Society leaders, Buxton and Lord Sheffield, doggedly pursued a prudent course of action in relation to Colonial slavery and, correspondingly, rejected any direct interference in American slavery, believing the British example sufficed. On the other hand, the Agency society embraced hard-line anti-slavery policies that included denouncing US slavery. By February 1834, the latter London anti-slavery group, working with GES through George Thompson, declared itself principally directed to extinguishing slavery in the United States of America.³¹⁹ In a letter to Smeal, the Agency society commended the Glasgow Emancipation Society's actions and initiative, seen as spearheading the campaign for universal abolition.³²⁰

The relationship between the Agency society and GES is crucial in understanding the mindset of Murray and his colleagues. The new Emancipation Society imbued steadfast anti-slavery principles based on moral and religious precedent—slavery was inconsistent with their Christian beliefs and subversive to the interests of mankind—unwilling to accept anything less than immediate and total emancipation, *Fiat Justitia ruat Coelum*.³²¹ The Agency's motto: "Slavery is a crime before God, and therefore must be abolished," focusing on Christian principle and duty, most certainly appealed to the more fervent Glasgow committee personnel. Despite evangelical impulses, though, even GES ministers understood the ramifications of American slavery on British reform efforts, especially when Conservatives used it as a premise to undermine liberal initiatives; only the immediate and unconditional emancipation of American slaves could solve this ideological dilemma.³²²

³¹⁸ Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, pp. 73-85

³¹⁹ Agency Society, *To the Anti-Slavery Associations*, GES, *First Annual Report*, pp. 13-14, *GESMB*, pp. 23-27 (24 February 1834)

³²⁰ *GESMB*, Thompson to Smeal (18 February 1834), pp. 23-27 (24 February 1834)

³²¹ GES, *First Annual Report*, pp. 3, 22

³²² Agency Society, *To the Anti-Slavery Associations*, MASS, *Fifth annual report* (Boston, 1837), pp. 51-57, George Stephen and John Scoble, *Address to the Anti-Slavery Associations, and the Friends of Negro Emancipation throughout the United Kingdom* (London, 1835)

The old Glasgow anti-slavery society often dawdled, allowing conciliatory measures for West Indians, never truly embracing Dr. Thomson's absolutist position. GES lost conservative anti-slavery men who were unwilling to champion ultraist notions that condemned Christian slaveholders. Despite the ministerial loss, the number of reform-minded members and subscribers increased over the years. GES's stance against US slavery, though, initially deterred some radical reformers who, although abolitionists in thought, were unwilling to censure America. Men like Peter Mackenzie and John McAdam looked to American liberty and equality, especially universal franchise, as a model for British workers' rights. They were equally discouraged by the lack of attention given to "liberate the poor" and, in many ways, felt some anti-slavery adherents hid behind their abolitionist credentials, masking their true position in relation to British reform. Mackenzie and McAdam are only two examples of Glaswegian reformers who prioritized British workers' rights before the abolition of slavery, yet held strong anti-slavery beliefs. Although their idealization of American liberty did not mean they endorsed a complete social and political revolution, officially joining GES's attack of US slavery brought these very ideals into question and undermined radical reformist efforts.³²³ Aware of this conflict, the Emancipation society enjoined,

The friends of liberal measures—the advocates for a liberal Government, who have lately, so nobly distinguished themselves, and shown by how much they outnumber their opponents, how closely their causes and ours is allied...our regret that a greater proportion of them have not joined our standard.—We,—to a man, will be found in their ranks; why then, may not they join us?—They seek to advance their own, and their Nation's liberty....But whilst in common with them, we unite in the means used to advance our National liberty, we would not leave to their fate, our most destitute fellow-men in other countries.³²⁴

Glasgow's first undertaking was to finance Thompson's tour of America. Thompson accepted an invitation from Garrison and the NEASS to conduct abolitionist lectures throughout the States. GES and the Ladies' Auxiliary joined Dalkeith and Edinburgh Emancipation societies, alongside London's Agency, to completely finance his mission.³²⁵ While in America, Thompson teamed up with several prominent American abolitionists—Joshua Leavitt, Arthur and Lewis Tappan, Elizur Wright, Garrison, amongst others—helping established numerous anti-slavery auxiliary groups to the newly formed American

³²³ McAdam, *Autobiography*, pp. x, 81-82, *RG*, "Slavery" (23 February 1833), pp. 476-478

³²⁴ GES, *First Annual Report*, p. 8

³²⁵ GES, *First Annual Report*, pp. 9-13, 22-35, -----, *Second Annual Report*, p.10, *GESMB*, p. 3, 6, 30, 60 (7, 12 December 1833, 20 March 1834, and 9 June 1835)

Anti-Slavery Society. His presence caused great excitement in stateside anti and pro-slavery circles, including their respective media.³²⁶ Rice contended, “If his mission was of any importance it was so in the sense that it polarized opinion on slavery more sharply...Thompson’s visit was a Godsend to the supporters of slavery, since there were several ways in which he could be pilloried where other abolitionists could not.”³²⁷ Thompson’s own correspondence did reflect the volatile environment he encountered, reports of anti-abolitionist riots and Lynch Law casualties abounded; yet, he also confidently reported advancements in the American abolition movement.

Thompson’s fifteen-month tour most certainly divided US opinion; moreover, it was his exposure of American clerical and church complicity in slavery that significantly influenced GES’s future policy. Early on, Thompson forwarded a letter written by James G. Birney to Lewis Tappan, which bemoaned the collusion of Christian American bodies and slaveholding interests.³²⁸ The Scottish press printed Thompson’s missives, often laden with accounts of Southern clergy and religious newspapers defending slavery, while censuring Northern abolitionists.³²⁹ This, of course, was not news to American abolitionists. Rev. Bourne, an AASS committeeman, consistently rebuked his fellow American brethren not only for holding direct ties to slavery, but also for excusing the system. His first publication *The Book and slavery irreconcilable* (1816) espoused withholding of fellowship to slaveholders, which was again reiterated in his later *An address to the Presbyterian church, enforcing the duty of excluding all slaveholders from the "Communion of Saints."* (1833). However, it was his *Picture of Slavery* that insinuated, “the most obdurate adherents of slavery, are preachers of the gospel, and officers and members of the church.”³³⁰ Birney also challenged church leaders in a letter addressed to Presbyterian Church elders and ministers.³³¹ The American *Anti-Slavery Record*, produced by AASS, frequently uncovered ministerial complicity involving

³²⁶ *Abolitionist*, “Mission to the United States,” 1:1 (August, 1834), pp. 34-37, *CM*, “Mr. Thompson and American Slavery” (18 January 1836), *GESMB*, pp. 54-60 (18 March, 10 April, 9 June 1835, 18 January 1836), *GC*, “Anti-Abolition Riot in Boston” (19 and 22 January 1836)

³²⁷ C. Duncan Rice, “The Anti-Slavery Mission of George Thompson to the United States 1834-35,” *Journal of American Studies*, 2:1 (April 1968), pp. 13-31

³²⁸ James G. Birney to Lewis Tappan (3 February 1835), in James G. Birney, *Letters of James Gillespie Birney, 1831-1857*, ed. Dwight L. Dumond, I (Gloucester, MA, 1966), p. 185, *GESMB*, p. 55 (10 April 1835)

³²⁹ *CM*, “Mr. Thompson and American Slavery” (18 January 1836), “American Slavery,” January 30, 1836

³³⁰ George Bourne, *An address to the Presbyterian church, enforcing the duty of excluding all slaveholders from the "Communion of Saints"* (New York, 1833), -----, *The Book and slavery irreconcilable*, -----, *Picture of Slavery*, pp. 7-15

³³¹ James G. Birney, *Letter to ministers and elders on the sin of holding slaves, and the duty of immediate emancipation* (New York, 1834)

Northern and Southern clergy, similarly questioning the ethics of admitting slaveholders into communion.³³²

The American society's *Declaration of Sentiments*, adopted on 4 December 1833, endeavored to achieve "purification of the churches from all participation in the guilt of slavery."³³³ Concern over clerical involvement dominated American abolitionist discussions. Rev. Simeon S. Jocelyn of New Haven insisted the American church's attitude to slavery directly affected abolition, as did churches in Britain. By embracing abolition, British religious bodies helped secure emancipation measures, albeit limited by the Apprenticeship scheme. Rev. Samuel J. May and others concurred with Jocelyn, believing, "that Christians in the non-slaveholding States, of every denomination, are under the highest obligation to do all that can be done by Christian means, to procure the immediate abolition of slavery." AASS responded by establishing a committee headed by Bourne to ascertain the numbers of ministers owning slaves, repeatedly urging British churches to demand their American brethren be repentant before continuing close relations with them.³³⁴

The New York Association of Gentlemen, headed by the Tappans, sought to utilize the British example in their propaganda war, by giving the anti-slavery movement some degree of respectability, therefore influencing the wider Anglo-American community. Opposition to their various benevolent exploits, seen by conservatives as obnoxious and interfering, dogged the wealthy NY abolitionists. Their advocacy for immediate emancipation, in particular, provoked angry mobs. Despite their penchant for progressive reform, they were still men of affluence and collaboration with the likes of Buxton and Wilberforce added an element of grandeur to the cause. It also explains why the New York committee refused to finance Garrison, a controversial working class abolitionist, for his 1833 trip to Britain.

Thompson's tour of America galvanized Scottish evangelical abolitionists into action. The EES responded with *A Voice to the United States of America*, resolving,

³³² AASS, "Anti-Slavery Meetings in Pittsburgh," 1:3 (March, 1835), pp. 28-29, "What has the Church to Do with Slaves?" 1:5:7 (May and July 1835), pp. 58-59, 80-84

³³³ AASS, *Declaration of Sentiments*, Philadelphia Anti-Slavery Convention, dated 4 December 1833 (Boston, 1834)

³³⁴ AASS, *First annual report* (New York, 1834), pp. 17-32, GES, *Second Annual Report*, pp. 31, 36, -----, *Third Annual Report*, pp. 53-56, *SIA*, "Letter from Dr. S. H. Cox, on Holding Christian Communion with Slave-holders or Slave-dealers" (August, 1836), pp. 32-35

We remember with delight the claims of common Parentage, Language and Interests, and rejoice in the many Institutions, Religious and Philanthropic, by which America is signalized; and view, with corresponding regret and condemnation, the support given to Slavery by Christian professors, Ministers, and Churches, and would adjure them by our common Christianity, and the public shame, thus put upon it, to weigh their conduct in the balance of the Sanctuary to give up their horrid traffic in the Bodies and Souls of men to put away from among them the accursed thing, to redeem the past, by awaking to righteousness, by emancipating and evangelizing their sable fellow citizens, and thus do homage to Him who hath made of one blood all nations of men.³³⁵

Thompson's mission, however, met with strong criticism from some clergy, the press, and upper classes. GES condemned those factions, especially the British media, who vilified Thompson in order "to pander to the vices and prejudices of the Americans."³³⁶ There seemed to be a constant battle between certain secular and religious British entities, those who refused to condemn US slavery in order to maintain cordial transatlantic relations, and abolitionist opinion, which decried the system as disgraceful to the Christian and Republic principles of America. This reality would become painfully obvious in the next few years when both the American and Scottish anti-slavery movements split. The Glasgow Emancipation Society issued an address to the ministry, highlighting the necessity of targeting US slavery despite British colonial slavery still existing, especially since American religious practices remained at odds with abolitionism. Thompson's tour had unearthed credible intelligence against religious bodies in America, enlightening British philanthropists. GES urged British clergy and religious institutions to denounce the affiliation; if not, silence on the matter would be construed as consent.³³⁷

During this period, GES was united in condemning American Christians for their complicity and complacency in regards to slavery. On 5 May 1836, during the annual meeting of the Congregational Union of Scotland, Rev. Wardlaw moved resolutions in favour of expostulating American brethren for slavery. Wardlaw, who maintained close-ties with prominent American clerics, such as Dr. Leonard Woods, admitted to being shocked, humbled by American church involvement in slavery. The United Associate Synod of the Secession Church, convened by Rev. Heugh, in April issued an address to American church bodies urging them to support efforts to liberate the slaves. Despite the close America-Scottish religious fraternity, the USC clergy viewed the transgression of slavery as a blot on America's escutcheon. The Scottish Relief Synod issued a spirited

³³⁵ EES, *Voice to the United States of America*, p. 16

³³⁶ GES, *Second Annual Report*, p. 23, EES, *Voice to the United States of America*, pp. 5-6

³³⁷ GES, *Address by the Committee of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, to the Ministers of Religion*, pp. 1-8, *GESMB*, pp. 87-88 (6 April 1836)

remonstrance against the conduct of their American brethren in relation to the slavery issue.³³⁸

This sort of politicking on behalf of the ministerial element of GES was not unusual considering their Voluntary exploits. In the 1830s, Heugh and Wardlaw, along with other Voluntaries like Dr. Ritchie of the EES, were often linked with radicalism due to their forceful agitation against the Church of Scotland. Their efforts to “purify” the Scottish national church from government influence, was paralleled by their aversion to the corruption of American Christianity by the slaveholding interest. Although Voluntary ministers and laymen dominated the Glasgow society, persons of differing faiths also presided; all denominations working together to eradicate the pro-slavery influence on US religious bodies, at the same time they sought to redeem American democratic ideals.

The Glasgow society vigorously condemned British ministers for pandering to their American brethren while visiting the US. Dr. F. A. Cox, British Baptist minister and member of the London Universal Abolition Society, portrayed himself as a staunch abolitionist, although he refused to criticize US slavery during a deputation to that country. GES criticized Cox’s duplicity, especially for declining to speak at AASS’s second annual meeting, in which he preferred to remain neutral on the subject. Despite condemning American Christians and advocating immediate abolition in Britain, Cox told US clerics he preferred colonization or expatriation schemes. The Glasgow committee similarly pilloried Drs. Matheson and Reed, believing the British ministers bolstered the anti-abolitionists by siding with Southern clergy in opposition to the AASS. The GES committee felt it was disingenuous for British ministers to support immediate abolition at home, to pander to the UK public, yet quickly volte-face the minute they hit the US. In this respect, the Glasgow abolitionists were not only expecting stateside clergy to be morally sound, but also British visiting clergy—*Fiat justitia ruat coelum*, to do what is right despite the consequences.³³⁹

Other British abolitionists were quick to follow GES’s lead, censuring British clergy who apologized or sympathized with American church involvement with slavery. In the wider context, the Glasgow University Press republished Bourne’s *Picture of Slavery*, with an

³³⁸ GES, *Third Annual Report*, pp. 25-26, 105-109, USC, *An address on negro slavery to the Christian Churches in the United States of America* (Edinburgh, 1836), GES, *Third Annual Report*, p. 109

³³⁹ GES, *Second Annual Report*, pp. 25-27, James Matheson and Andrew Reed, *A Narrative of the Visit to the American Churches* (London, 1835)

introduction by CoS minister Rev. Cunningham and in England Rev. Thomas Price founded the publication *Slavery in America* to report on the progress of American abolitionists, as well as encourage the involvement of British religious bodies in remonstrating with their American cohorts. In line with GES and AASS, Price's articles called for an end to compromising policies, demanding British churches be consistent with their anti-slavery message to their American brethren, bowing to popularity or hospitality merely pandered to the pro-slavery interest, which used visiting ministerial accounts in their defence. *SIA* often published GES meetings, more so than several other larger, more affluent UK societies, demonstrating the society's popularity and resourcefulness. Rev. Thomas Willcocks lamented the damage done to US abolition, which caused disappointment and regret within the British religious community. By putting their alliance with American brethren before emancipation, he felt they endorsed a pusillanimous and temporizing policy. At the annual British Baptist Union, resolutions were approved that criticized Hoby and Cox for avoiding abolitionists, while condemning American Baptists involved in slavery. Some regional societies rejected fellowship altogether with their stateside brethren until the slavery issue was settled.³⁴⁰

Amidst the rancor over US church collusion with slavery, GES had not lost sight of American democratic ideals, espoused in the Declaration of Independence; although glaringly violated by the enslavement black Americans. Thompson personally viewed those upholding slavery as traitors to liberty and the Constitution.³⁴¹ Well before Thompson's mission, GES agreed to obtain signatures for a memorial to the President, Congress and people of the United States. The address reiterated several viewpoints upheld by GES: an acknowledgement of national consanguinity between America and Britain—social, cultural, and religious ties; and the opinion that slavery violated man's rights, both through civil and religious precedent.³⁴² The Glasgow committee also appealed to the British public on behalf of AASS to support the abolitionists of America,

³⁴⁰ Bourne, *Picture of Slavery in the United States of America; being a practical illustration of Voluntaryism and Republicanism* (Glasgow, 1835)—Glasgow Edition, GES, *Free church alliance with manstealers* (Glasgow, 1846), pp. 29-37, *SIA*, "Annual Meeting of the Baptist Union," pp. 17-23 (July, 1836), "Discussion between George Thompson and the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge," p. 17 (July, 1836), "Letter from Dr. S. H. Cox, on Holding Christian Communion with Slave-Holders or Slave-Dealers," pp. 32-35, (August, 1836), "Review of The Baptists in America, by Rev. Drs. Cox and Hoby" (August, 1836), pp. 36-41, "Report of the Discussion on American Slavery in Dr. Wardlaw's Chapel," (September, 1836), pp. 61-65

³⁴¹ GC, "Mr. Thompson's Letter to Mr. Garrison" (19 and 22 January 1836), *SIA*, "Glasgow Emancipation Society Meeting" (September, 1836), p. 68

³⁴² *GESMB*, pp. 30-33 (20 March 1834), *To the President, Senate, and Representatives of the United States, in General Congress assembled, and to the People of America generally*, reprinted in *Imperial Magazine*, vol. 4 (April, 1834), pp. 158-162

“who are more exposed to the assaults of the enemies of human liberty” for upholding the precepts of the late Dr. Thomson, which advocated immediate and unconditional emancipation without mitigation, apprenticeship or compensation. The stance of the Glasgow society admitted the obvious, harsh reality of American equality and liberty; however, equally looked forward to its restoration as a prime example of a liberal and progressive nation.³⁴³

The debate between Thompson and American Rev. Robert J. Breckenridge, hosted by the Glasgow committee, received considerable exposure on both sides of the Atlantic. GES was keen to publicly repudiate Rev. Breckenridge’s seemingly apologist stance. The society felt the noted Presbyterian wanted to disunite abolitionists in Britain, by providing information contrary to anti-slavery reports, in hopes of preserving Anglo-American Christian relations.³⁴⁴ Breckenridge’s seemingly anti-slavery sentiments did not wash with GES, nor was he supported, in general, by the audiences that attended the debates en masse. To the Glasgow abolitionists, the solution was simple in relation to slavery—“the principle of doing, and doing immediately, whatever the law of God, in spirit and in precept, demands, without regard to consequences.” In other words, *Fiat justitia ruat coelum*. In reference to American Christians holding slaves, Rev. Wardlaw resolutely declared,

If it is a fellowship which requires to be maintained by connivance at iniquity and oppression—if it is not to be enjoyed without entering into a compact to be silent or to be inactive, on topics respecting which we feel it our incumbent and indispensable duty to ‘lift up our voices like a trumpet,’ and show our brethren their sin—then I say, with whatever reluctance and whatever pain, let the fellowship cease!³⁴⁵

With equal regard for American ideals, Rev. King, a GES member, noted,

The American declaration of rights, which declare personal liberty an undoubted and inalienable property, of which man may on no pretext despoil man, seems to promise fair for the most liberal benevolence, and how lamentable, then, is it that America is, nevertheless, the great seat of the abhorrent evil which we are labouring to eradicate...We see much in America

³⁴³ GES, *Address of the Glasgow Emancipation Society-To the Friends of the Enslaved*, -----, *Second Annual Report*, pp. 1-21, 29-30

³⁴⁴ GES, *Third Annual Report*, p. 17, AASS, *Fourth Annual Report* (New York, 1837), pp. 36-39, AR, “Britain and America,” 59 (November, 1836), pp. 352-358, SIA, “Discussion between Mr. George Thompson and the Rev. R. J. Breckenridge” (July, 1836), p. 17

³⁴⁵ AASS, *Fourth Annual Report*, pp. 36-39, GES, *American slavery: speeches at the public meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society* (Glasgow, 1836)

to love and imitate—many of its institutions—many of its worthies—but we will not, cannot countenance its slavery...but not until then, may America become what she claims to be—the glory, and admiration, and rejoicing of the whole enlightened world.³⁴⁶

This absolutist, unwavering attitude of the GES was similarly paralleled by a core group of American abolitionists. Hailed as steadfast in principle—both by the command of God and the dictates of justice, not bowing to the popular breeze, despite the consequences. Like the Glasgow abolitionists, they viewed the fight against US slavery as two-fold: in one respect, to uphold the exemplary ideals of the Declaration of Independence; and in another, to maintain pure, unadulterated Christian duty.

Abolitionists hold it “to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, possessing certain inalienable rights, as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;” “that we ought to do unto others as we would that others should do unto us,” that no man has a right to hold his fellow-man as property, and that he who does it, ought to cease from doing it, immediately.³⁴⁷

This ideology became fairly mainstream in Scottish anti-slavery circles. One of the largest remonstrances issued to Americans on the subject of slavery came from Dumbarton and the Vale of Leven, which was issued after appeals by GES for further remonstrances against US slavery. The address, likewise, upheld several abolitionist principles—slavery was a violation of the rights of man, established by God, who bequeathed man natural rights of life and liberty. The Vale of Leven appeal, republished stateside, looked to the Declaration of Independence as a manifestation of this very ideal but lamented the “dark stain” on the “banner of liberty.” Recalling the struggle of American revolutionaries, they proclaimed, “Rise, ye children of our forefathers—quit like men—be strong, and fear not. Let your righteousness shine forth as the light; and your judgment as the noon-day.”³⁴⁸

Rev. Somerville entreated Glasgow and other Scottish abolitionist societies to repeat Dumbarton and Vale of Leven’s sentiments in their own national remonstrance. GES’s response stated,

We entreat you as freemen, and as patriots, to weight, seriously, the

³⁴⁶ GES, *American slavery*

³⁴⁷ David Root, *The abolition cause eventually triumphant* (Andover, 1836), pp. 1-24

³⁴⁸ GES, *Third Annual Report*, pp. 97-105, 111-115, AASS, *Fourth Annual Report*, p. 39, Rev. A. Somerville, *An Affectionate Expostulation with Christians in the United States of America* (1837), reprinted in *SIA*, “Dumbarton and Vale of Leven,” 10 (April, 1837), pp. 221-226. AASS referred to this document as the Vale of Leven remonstrance, “signed by more than four thousand of old Scotia’s ‘hardy sons of rustic toil.’”

circumstances of your country, and to consider the bearing of the present conflict of opinions upon the future liberties and destinies of America. Many of your public acts show that you have enlarged views of the rights of white men, and we wish that you would lay aside those prejudices which are founded upon the colour of skin, and extend these views to your African brethren. The basis of free government is the recognition of the principle that all men, being equal in the sight of God, are entitled to equal liberty, protection, and encouragement, and that the only differences which society acknowledges, are those which arise from superior wisdom, industry, and moral worth.³⁴⁹

GES and the Paisley Emancipation Society followed Somerville's lead by sending addresses directly to American citizens, churches and government, although the EES did not. Both documents echoed Rev. Somerville's emphasis on American liberties and the rights of man; yet, lamented Christian involvement in slavery—concepts the Glasgow society had long alluded to in the struggle against US slavery. It was this uncompromising, idealistic concept of immediate abolitionism that would eventually divide not only the American anti-slavery movement, but, inevitably, split the Glasgow Emancipation Society. By the end of the 1830s, those who staunchly upheld such concepts were increasingly seen as radicals and ultraists, with no consideration for the ramifications of immediatism on the unification of the American States and Churches. In Glasgow, though, the battle had only just begun.

³⁴⁹ GES, *Remonstrance of the Members of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, and the Friends of Universal Freedom, with the Citizens of the United States; especially the Members of Christian Churches, on the Subject of Slavery* (Glasgow, 1837), -----, *Third Annual Report*, pp. 97-105, 111-115

“By uniting we stand, by dividing we fall”³⁵⁰

Chapter IV

Since its inception, GES secretaries Murray and Smeal kept members abreast of abolition-related developments in America. Much of the collected intelligence was gleaned from US journals, newspapers and other publications related to anti-slavery regularly sent via packet steamers or conveyed by visiting abolitionists. This knowledge was used to gauge society actions in relation to the dissemination of information to the public; formulation of official correspondence; organization of local meetings; and influenced Glasgow’s interaction with other British anti-slavery groups. GES minute books, compiled by Smeal, frequently relayed American happenings, such as the petitioning for abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia and against recognition of Texan independence; later documenting events such as John Brown’s insurrection at Harper’s Ferry and the infamous Amistad affair.³⁵¹ Similarly, Murray and Smeal’s awareness of more routine aspects of American slavery—various state slave codes, pro-slavery media and publications, slave-related advertisements and auctions—demonstrated their own understanding and partiality to the American situation. Other members had access to one of the many coffee rooms situated in and around Glasgow, which not only carried various domestic papers, but often international publications, especially from America.

The Glasgow Emancipation Society secretaries basically ran the show. Behind the scenes Murray and Smeal conducted the bulk of the communications, lobbying and research, advocating a more radical abolitionist agenda along the lines of Dr. Thomson’s argument—*Fiat justitia ruat coelum*. During the initial years, even the more temperate members of the group endorsed this stance, very rarely questioning official publications issued by the secretaries. Not surprising considering most committee members simultaneously championed other sociopolitical causes—reform and Voluntaryism, in particular. Scottish reformers were antithetical to the Tories, also viewed as the West Indian interest; while the Voluntaries argued for disestablishment of the Church of Scotland, the denomination most linked with orthodoxy and virtually absent from later

³⁵⁰ John Dickson, “The Liberty Song,” in *Boston Chronicle* (29 August 1768)

³⁵¹ *GESMB*, pp. 60, 106-107, 149-156, 213, 219-220, 243-245, 264, 276 (10 April 10, 1835; 15 March 1837; 15 October and 23 December 1839; 2 August and 18 November 18, 1841; 14 March and 2 August 1844; 17 July 1845)

anti-slavery agitation. Scottish political and religious reformers were often linked with radicalism, due to their fervent campaigning, GES members representing the bulk of Glaswegian middle-class progressive reformers. This was not unique to Scotland; throughout Britain abolition was intricately linked with both issues, which were chiefly espoused by Dissenters, who, following the repeal of the Test and Corporations Act, became a powerful political body.³⁵²

At the formation of GES all three major sociopolitical issues had peaked—the Reform Bill for Scotland and Scottish Voluntaryism came into fruition in 1832, while the Act of Emancipation was approved in 1833. Secessionists and reformers, previously social and political underdogs, were now in the ascendant and, correspondingly, felt emboldened by their increased clout. In Glasgow, several anti-slavery advocates represented the two major reform bodies, the Reform Association and the Political Union, and were elected to the first Reform council. Their ministers and laymen were active leaders in the Voluntary movement, participating in both campaigns simultaneously.³⁵³ Both GES secretaries, Murray and Smeal, advocated political and social reform; in religion both belonged to non-establishment denominations—Murray, Relief Secession and committee member of the Glasgow Voluntary Society; and Smeal, Society of Friends and member of the Glasgow Bible Society.³⁵⁴

This initial zeal for social, political and religious reform underpinned the aims of the original Glasgow Emancipation members. Murray and Smeal facilitated the actual day-to-day operations of the group, while the more public figureheads, such as Lord Provost Robert Grahame and Dr. Wardlaw, contributed mainly through their presence, which added prestige to the society's activities. This is not to undermine the influential role played by several noteworthy individuals—leaders in politics, religion and society in general, who often spoke at GES public meetings and spread their anti-slavery sentiment throughout the media, pulpit and social contacts. However, it is important to understand

³⁵² *Congregational Magazine*, "Voluntary Churchmen—the Scottish Movement" (April, 1834), pp. 201-215

³⁵³ Brown, *Biographical sketches*, pp. 1-24, *Congregational Magazine*, "Voluntary Churchmen—the Scottish Movement," pp. 205-206. GES reformers elected in November 1833: Lord Provost, Robert Grahame of Whitehill; First District, William Craig and James Turner of Thrushgrove (GES subscriber and later CM); Second District, John Ure (GES subscriber and later CM); Third District, James Beith; and Fifth District, John Fleming, Andrew McGeorge and Thomas Muir. GES Voluntaries included: Revs. William Anderson, Hugh Heugh, and Ralph Wardlaw, as well as several laymen.

³⁵⁴ Joseph Joshua Green, "William Smeal (1793-1877) Obituary," in *The Annual Monitor* (London, 1878), pp. 146-157, Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, p. 208. For full information, see Chapter I, pp. 13-16.

that from the very beginning, the GES secretaries had control over the inner-workings of the society and when divisions later occurred this was not due to the radicalization of Murray and Smeal but instead to the regressive standpoint of the more conservative members.

Consensus and solidarity of purpose

Upon his return from America, GES continued to employ Thompson to lecture throughout Britain and Ireland on US slavery. His first port of call, in accordance with the Glasgow committee, was to travel around Scotland, addressing audiences in Dunfermline, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Greenock, and Leith; including religious bodies such as the United Associated Synod and the Congregational Union of Scotland. Between January and June 1836, Thompson delivered speeches detailing his efforts to bolster US abolitionism. Most meetings highlighted American church involvement in slavery and those in Edinburgh were, especially, popular. Responding to demands for such information, Thompson's lectures were periodically advertised under the subject, "What has Christianity to do with American Slavery?"³⁵⁵ The lectures held in conjunction with anti-slavery societies and religious bodies directly resulted in several remonstrances addressed to American citizens. Thompson's discussions paralleled the views of GES—condemnation of US slavery and rebuke of Christian involvement, although not intended to malign Americans:

He did not appear there to revile the Americans, though they had hunted him like a partridge on the mountains...He would not even speak slightly of America. It was true he hated her sins; it was not less true that he loved her sons...unfortunately Christian America, Republican America, America the land of Bibles, and tracts, and missionary societies, at the very moment that she piqued herself on being the finest country on the face of the globe, had her slave ships...and put forth her presumptuous hand and traded in the lives and the souls of men.³⁵⁶

³⁵⁵ *CM*, "Mr. Thompson and American Slavery" (18 January 1836), "American Slavery" (30 January 1836), GES, *Second Annual Report*, pp. 7, 31, -----, *Third Annual Report*, p. 53, *GESMB*, pp. 74-75, 81, 87, 90 (18 January, 1 March, 6 April, 8 June 1836), *Scotsman*, "Mr. Thompson's Mission to America" (23 January 1836)—Edinburgh meeting, "American Slavery—Mr. George Thompson" (30 January 1836)—Edinburgh meeting, "Christianity versus Slavery" and "Public Meeting—American Slavery" (10 February 1836)—Edinburgh meeting, "Mr. George Thompson" (23 February 1836)—Glasgow meeting, "Slavery in America" (24 February 1836)—Leith, "Slavery in America" (27 February and 20 April 1836)—Dumfermline and Greenock meetings, "United Associate Synod" (23 April 1836), "Edinburgh Temperance Society" (30 April 1836), "Congregational Union of Scotland" (7 May 1836), "Slavery in America" (11, 18, 22 June 1836). The *Scotsman* reported in February 1836 that due to demand Thompson held at least four separate lectures to the citizens of Edinburgh.

³⁵⁶ *CM*, "American Slavery—Mr. G. Thompson" (30 January 1836). Quote from Thompson.

Thompson's fervent abolitionist attitude often invoked the legacy of Dr. Thomson, demanding the instant and total annihilation of American slavery despite the consequences. This radical stance, though, is often attributed to Thompson's relationship with William Lloyd Garrison.³⁵⁷ As mentioned before, Garrison advocated a strict policy of immediatism, without regard to social, economic or political consequences. Garrison was a protégé of Rev. George Bourne and Benjamin Lundy, both Americans who were early adherents of immediate emancipation. Nonetheless, it was Dr. Thomson of Edinburgh who also figured strongly in Garrison's abolitionist ideology during 1832 when he migrated from a colonizationist stance to that of immediate.³⁵⁸ It was upon this absolutist premise that Garrison and Thompson, along with the more progressive members of GES, forged life-long ties. During the second half of the 1830s, this doctrine still resonated with the majority of the Glasgow committee, who proclaimed,

Let the friends of human rights again rally under the banner which had aforetime led them to battle—under which they had fought, and together triumphed—and remember that the motto inscribed upon its ample folds—a motto which, though oft abused, had oft sustained them in the hour of conflict—was, “*Fiat Justitia ruat Coleum*.”³⁵⁹

Thompson, like Garrison, was a contentious figure. Through the Glasgow society, Thompson publicly challenged “any antagonist, especially any Minister of the Gospel from the United States, on the subject of American Slavery.”³⁶⁰ Eminent Presbyterian minister, Robert J. Breckinridge of Baltimore, accepted the challenge and GES hosted five open nights of discussions between the two adversaries from 13-17 June 1836. The debate divided opinion on both sides of the Atlantic. Staunch American and Scottish anti-slavery groups applauded Thompson's behavior, viewing the outcome of the debate as proof of the temporizing attitude of the stateside clerics. The Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society dedicated no less than thirteen pages of its *Fifth Annual Report* describing Thompson's efforts in the US, its knock-on effect on Scottish abolitionism, including a lengthy piece on his dispute with Breckinridge, and GES's prominent role in the fight against American slavery. Boston publisher Issac Knapp reprinted the Glasgow edition fully covering the debates, including a letter from Charles Stuart and notes by Garrison. AASS's *Fourth*

³⁵⁷ Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, pp. 77-78

³⁵⁸ WLG, *African colonization*, pp. 78, 87

³⁵⁹ George Thompson, *Discussion on American slavery* (Glasgow, 1836), p. 81. Thompson's speech during a GES meeting on 16 June 1836.

³⁶⁰ *GESMB*, p. 98-100 (1 August 1836)

Annual Report praised Thompson and GES for their conduct and opinions, acknowledging the “immense importance of British sympathy and concurrence to the cause of Emancipation in the United States.”³⁶¹ During the 1830s, AASS looked to British Christians for validation and support for American abolitionist efforts. Scottish anti-slavery activities, especially GES, were often reported in their publications, aimed at influencing Americans who were socially and culturally linked with the old country. Back in Scotland, several publications reported the meetings positively and GES highly commended Thompson’s actions.³⁶²

What initially appeared as a signal triumph for immediatist opinion over that of the gradual, apologetic view of American Christian bodies, though, equally perturbed trans-Atlantic commentators. The *New York Observer* disavowed some of Breckinridge’s opinion on the slavery question, although it lambasted Thompson’s critique of American institutions and character. It raised objections to British Christian rebuke on slavery and condemned the treatment of Breckinridge, a delegate of the American Presbyterian General Assembly. The *NYO* felt the Glaswegian society had no business lecturing about slavery to Americans, when Britain itself was still conspicuously involved in slavery worldwide.³⁶³ GES never ignored the painful comparison, in fact it was often acknowledged in their reports covering Brazil, Cuba, India, and the Orient. The editor of *NYO*, Sidney E. Morse, however, was a typical apologist for American Christians involved in slavery. He despised what he deemed “ultra abolitionists” (i.e. Garrison and Thompson), those who attacked the American Constitution and religious bodies over slavery. This was partially due to displaced patriotism, defending US social, political and religious institutions by rationalizing the slavery problem. Later, he defended the Scottish Free Church for accepting money from Southern churches and attended the Evangelical Alliance, leading the group of Americans protesting against the exclusion of slaveholders.

Within some American religious circles, Thompson was considered as fanatical as Garrison and deemed the “rampant abolitionist of Scotland.” On the other hand, the more

³⁶¹ AASS, *Fourth Annual Report*, reprinted in *Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine*, II (July, 1837), pp. 352-356, MASS, *Fifth Annual Report*, pp. 51-64, George Thompson, *Discussion on American slavery...with notes by Mr. Garrison*, Second Edition (Boston, 1836)

³⁶² GES, *American slavery*, pp. 1-8, *SIA*, “Discussion between Mr. George Thompson and Rev. R. J. Breckinridge” (July, 1836), p. 17, “Report of the Discussions on American Slavery in Dr. Wardlaw’s Chapel, between Mr. George Thompson and the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, Glasgow” (September, 1836), pp. 61-65, *Scotsman*, “Glasgow Emancipation Society” (2 July 1836)

³⁶³ *AR*, “Britain and America” (November, 1836), pp. 351-358. The quote from the *New York Observer* was reprinted in the *AR*.

moderate Breckinridge strengthened his own standing within the American religious community and there is some evidence that Thompson's zealous behavior met with similar disapproval within Britain.³⁶⁴ On 1 August 1836, GES called a public meeting to discuss the Breckinridge and Thompson debate, while reiterating their uncompromising belief in the "great principle of Immediate, Unconditional, and Universal Emancipation." The purpose of the meeting was to vindicate Thompson of any impropriety. Speaking on behalf of the Glasgow society, Dr. Wardlaw firmly rejected any critique of Thompson, directly reproving Breckinridge and any US churches implicated in slavery and/or apologizing for its existence. The GES committee approved several resolutions supporting Thompson's stance against American enslavement and, by taking an absolutist position, intimated that fellowship with American Christians implicated in slavery should cease—a proposition first recommended to the Glasgow society by Thompson himself.³⁶⁵

The Breckinridge affair unearthed two major differences of opinion within the anti-slavery ranks of America, which affected abolitionist efforts in Scotland: first, the controversial issue of Christian slaveholders and fellowship; and two, askewed US pretensions to liberty, with the glaring inconsistency of slavery, but also demonstrated by the Texan war. Breckinridge represented a class of Americans, ministers included, sympathetic to the cause of the slaves (even considering themselves anti-slavery, although not abolitionist) that sought to justify, even placate their fellow countrymen in order to avoid disunion of both the churches and the states. He rejected Thompson's various examples of church complicity in slavery, denying that US churches had any power to influence or overthrow the system. According to him, abolitionists like Thompson, forced clerics to make decisions based on the slavery question that conflicted with their church and peers. Likewise, he believed denunciations against American slavery, pressuring citizens to choose sides on the contentious issue, would only lead to civil war.³⁶⁶ Later, in a retort directed at the Glasgow Emancipation Society, Breckinridge lambasted their views on American slavery and Christian fellowship connected therewith; calling into question

³⁶⁴ GES, *Second Annual Report*, pp. 23, 25, Jonathan Blanchard and Nathan Lewis Rice, *A Debate on Slavery* (Cincinnati, 1846), p. 376. The report noted that some British periodicals and ministers, such as Dr. Cox of Hackney (member of the London Committee for Universal Abolition), did not support Thompson.

³⁶⁵ GES, *American slavery*, pp. 1-8

³⁶⁶ *Discussion on American slavery, in Dr. Wardlaw's Chapel, between Mr. George Thompson and the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, of Baltimore, United States*, Second Edition (Boston, 1836), pp. 60-67

Britain's own conduct in relation to Africa, Asia and West Indian enslavement. More importantly, though, he identified himself as an anti-abolitionist.³⁶⁷

Breckinridge's attitude towards the Texan revolt also shed light on this dichotomy. Unlike American abolitionists and their Scottish allies, who he poignantly opposed, the minister viewed the conflict between Mexico and Texas as a battle for the progress of liberty, in the same vein as the American Revolution. Breckinridge was outraged by British abolitionists remonstrating against the Texans, denying the Texas-Mexico affair had anything to do with enlarging slave territories.³⁶⁸ The Glasgow society, however, concurred with John Quincy Adams, Benjamin Lundy and AASS who viewed the war as a grand deception, carried out by slaveholders and land speculators only interested in enlarging US slave territories—not a defense of liberty. Adams, a former President of the United States, described the situation as “a war for the re-establishment of slavery where it was abolished. It is not a servile war, but a war between slavery and emancipation, and every possible effort has been made to drive us into the war, on the side of slavery.”³⁶⁹ Lundy challenged Texan claims to defending “the sacred principles of Liberty, and the natural, inalienable Rights of Man,” instead calling the hostilities a “flagrant violation of national laws, of human rights, and the eternal, immutable principles of Justice.”³⁷⁰

AASS and NEASS had long questioned Texan motives in respect to independence, fearing the extension of slave states in the South, especially if the American government annexed the new Republic, providing leverage to pro-slavery interests in Congress. Both groups condemned the covert actions of southern planters and politicians who eyed Texas as a future market for slaves, supplanting American settlers into the region to displace the Mexican population.³⁷¹ By 1836, American abolitionists campaigned heavily against the recognition of Texan independence, flooding the media with evidence to demonstrate its direct links with US pro-slavery interests. The national society uniformly agreed the Texas-Mexico conflict was fueled by the pro-slavery and landed interest. In their opinion, the independence of Texas, followed by US acquisition of the state, would imbalance

³⁶⁷ *Discussion on American slavery*, Appendix, pp. 9-12. Breckinridge's letter (dated 20 August 1836).

³⁶⁸ *Discussion on American slavery*, p. 11

³⁶⁹ Benjamin Lundy, *The war in Texas* (Philadelphia, 1836), pp. 2-3, 34-37. The “grand deception” is quoted from Lundy. Adams speech to the House of Representatives, dated 25 May 1835, is reprinted in Lundy's pamphlet.

³⁷⁰ Lundy, *Texas*, pp. 3, 34-37

³⁷¹ *American Anti-Slavery Reporter (AASRP)*, 7:1 (July, 1834), pp. 109-110, NEASS, *Proceedings of the New England Anti-Slavery Convention*, (Boston, 1834), p. 35

legislature power in favour of the slavery interest, crippling anti-slavery congressional efforts.³⁷²

Scottish abolitionists, especially GES, whole-heartedly embraced the new political controversy, dedicating significant resources to publicly lobbying against Texan independence. Thompson first broached the subject while lecturing in Edinburgh, calling for a meeting on Texas War to discuss the implications for US slavery—the extension of slave territories and the revival of the slave trade. The crowded event held in the Waterloo Hotel on 30 December 1836 was attended by eminent political and religious figures.³⁷³ As early as 1835, various Scottish papers reported the Texas-Mexico debate, questioning the motives of the Texans, although the association with slavery had yet to be discussed.³⁷⁴ The *Scotsman* even printed news of Scots volunteering for the Texans, convinced of their “revolutionary spirit.”³⁷⁵ The Glasgow committee, represented by several pro-American reformists, was, therefore, eager to discredit the Texans as revolutionaries or freedom fighters—certainly not in the same league as the founding fathers of America.

The very political nature of the Texas question and GES’s strong response to it, demonstrated the society’s willingness to agitate against US slavery by means other than moral suasion or religious premise. The committee unanimously supported GES resolutions concerning Texas. Their report gave extensive information on Texan history, including the 1829 decree by Mexico abolishing slavery. Members viewed the Texan Constitution as irreconcilable to the principle of righteousness and liberty. Their opposition to Texan independence, largely based on accounts published by Lundy and commentary by Adams, reflected their consistency with American abolitionist opinion.³⁷⁶ On the domestic front, other high-profile British anti-slavery adherents were also concerned. Dr. Lushington and Thomas Buxton discussed the matter in Parliament, condemning those involved as “American slave jobbers” interested only in obtaining another market for slaves.³⁷⁷ GES led British abolitionist opposition against Texas, most

³⁷² *Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine (QASM)*, vol. 1 (New York, 1837), pp. 30 (Third Anniversary Meeting, May 10, 1836), 193-205 (January, 1836), 314, 382 (July, 1836)

³⁷³ *CM*, “Mr. G. Thompson—War in Texas” (31 December 1836), Lundy, *Texas*, p. 55, *Scotsman*, “Public Meeting” (28 December 1836)

³⁷⁴ *CM*, “Affairs of Texas” (30 November 1835). The article was reprinted from the *New York Courier*, 31 October 1835.

³⁷⁵ *Scotsman*, “United States” (12 December 1835)

³⁷⁶ *GESMB*, p. 107 (March 15, 1837), GES, *Third Annual Report*, pp. 80-97

³⁷⁷ Lundy, *Texas*, pp. 38-41. Lundy’s notes on the Commons debate “Revolt in Texas” for 30 June 1836. Quote by Dr. Lushington.

societies only officially lobbied against Texas by the late 1830s, when BFASS was established.

GES prepared memorials to the Foreign Office, petitioning against the recognition of Texan independence by the British government, a prelude to the annexation of the Republic by the United States. They fiercely criticized US governmental actions as treacherous and Britain's own indifference by not remonstrating to prevent the separation of Texas. GES's increasingly political deportment, likewise indicated by its vigorous campaign to free the Amistad captives, reflected the reforming influence within the committee versus the strictly religious or evangelical aspect of the group. The memorial to the Foreign Office concerning the Amistad captives, written by John Murray, stated the slaves acted appropriately by killing the Captain, his death deemed as justifiable homicide. This statement indicates the increasingly militant stance taken by various members of GES, which contributed to the later divisions within the society. Smeal's memorial to the Foreign Office against the recognition of Texan independence was equally radical in that it demanded emancipation of slaves in Texas as a precursor to British acknowledgement of the new Republic.³⁷⁸

The final united effort by the original GES members, prior to divisions in 1840-41, was their campaign to annihilate the Apprenticeship System, the last vestiges of slavery in the West Indies. The Emancipation Act of 1833 disappointed hardcore Glasgow abolitionists, who viewed the measure as an intermediate step between apprenticeship and slavery.³⁷⁹ Although some ministerial committee members, like Dr. Wardlaw, perceived the liberation of colonial slaves as an atonement of Britain's sins, upholding compensation as a fair sacrifice for its participation in the system.³⁸⁰ Wardlaw's parishioners derived from the upper levels of Glaswegian society, including those who had ties with slaveholding in the West Indies. Despite his allusions to immediatism, his *Jubilee Sermon* demonstrated his continued attachment to this interest by his unqualified support for compensation. Wardlaw was mainly interested in the spiritual welfare of the slaves and believed the Emancipation Act allowed ample time for them to be Christianized, which was considered a major step towards civilization.

³⁷⁸ *GESMB*, pp. 149-156 (15 October and 23 December 1839), GES, *Fifth Annual Report*, pp. 19, 92-95, -----, *Sixth Annual Report*, pp. 9-12, 20-21

³⁷⁹ GES, *First Annual Report*, p. 17

³⁸⁰ Ralph Wardlaw, *The jubilee*, pp. 1-37

In this aspect, his attitude corresponded more with Dr. Chalmers, but clashed with the general consensus of GES. The majority objected to the Apprenticeship clause, which enforced a further six years of servitude on adult Negroes, a far cry from immediate emancipation; and the compensation scheme decreed in the Act, in essence, legitimized the right of property in men—both issues strenuously condemned by the Glasgow society, as well as the late Dr. Thomson. In many ways, the ameliorating policies offered in the Abolition Act of 1833, paralleled the half-measures offered by the Reform Act of 1832—neither fully addressed public concerns for wider reform. During GES's public meeting to mark the occasion, Robert Purvis, a black abolitionist from Philadelphia, proposed a resolution giving thanks to God for the abolition of British colonial slavery. However, resolutions for their first annual meeting, held on 25 February 1835, completely ignored the measure, since the GES committee knew full well it did not free the West Indian slaves and, likewise, failed to address enslavement in other parts of the British Empire. The corresponding report reiterated their endorsement of immediate and universal emancipation, despite the consequences—*Fiat Justitia, ruat Coelum*.³⁸¹

In mid-1835 it came as no surprise to the Glasgow society that several circulars from London anti-slavery societies described horrific violations of the Abolition Act, including the flogging of slaves. GES minute books often recorded instances of slave cruelty reported in the *Jamaican Watchman* and other sources. As the controversy progressed, the committee enlisted the aid of George Stephen to collect evidence and represent British colonial slaves. The Glasgow Emancipation Society resolved to campaign against Apprenticeship, demanding that Parliament withhold payment of compensation until conditions of the Act were met, while enlisting the support of Glasgow MPs, James Oswald and Colin Dunlop, to support Buxton's 16 June motion in the House. Murray and Smeal immediately set forth a plan of action to disseminate copies of GES's resolutions to city officials and other politicians sympathetic to cause; including printing said information in the *Glasgow Chronicle* and producing several dozen copies for members of Parliament.³⁸²

Between 1835-1838, up until the final abolition of slavery in the West Indies on 2 August, the society held no less than seventeen meetings to discuss the subject. GES complained to Lord Glenelg, His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonial Department,

³⁸¹ GES, *First Annual Report*, pp. 16-22, ----, Fourth Annual Report, pp. 21-27, *GESMB*, pp. 43-48 (4 August 1834), 60-63 (9 June 1835)

³⁸² *GESMB*, pp. 60-63 (9 June 1835), pp. 71-72 (28 December 1835), 83-87 (3-28 March 1836)

that slaves were being illegally imported and unjustly detained in Mauritius, despite their entitlement to freedom; further demanding a formally inquiry, notwithstanding the Government's reluctance to do so.³⁸³ By early 1836, the Glasgow Ladies Emancipation Society was enlisted to lobby against Apprenticeship and after setting up shop in the city, the men's society garnered 29,830 signatures for their Commons petition, which was eagerly supported by Glasgow MP Oswald, Irish MP O'Connell and Joseph Pease, English abolitionist. GES also prepared a memorial to Viscount Melbourne, Premier and First Lord of the Treasury, questioning the legitimacy of the 45th and 46th clauses of the Act that allowed compensation, which many of them objected on principle alone, and they wanted the colonies to be fined for disregarding imperial laws.³⁸⁴

GES condemned the deception played upon the people of Britain, sympathetic to Colonial slaves. Again, restating their endorsement of immediate emancipation, as proclaimed by Dr. Thomson, they rejected any meliorating conditions that would be short of complete manumission. To them, mitigation was yet another palliative measure by the West Indian interest and government to extend the system of enslavement. The Glasgow society looked stateside for inspiration, declaring, "To the credit of American Abolitionists be it told, that from them we hear nothing of Mitigation-nothing of Apprenticeship-nothing of Compensation-but Immediate and unconditional Emancipation."³⁸⁵ During its Apprenticeship campaign, GES continued to work closely with the AASS against American slavery. Obtaining complete emancipation for Colonial slaves, though, in GES's opinion, meant more than the eradication of British guilt from slavery, it directly influenced the course of US abolitionism.

That the deliberate judgment of this meeting, the Abolition of Negro Apprenticeship System in the Colonies of Great Britain, is intimately connected with the advancement of the Emancipation Cause in America; believing, as we do, that so long as the System is suffered to exist, the march of Freedom in the US must be proportionally retarded.³⁸⁶

The most outspoken critic of the Apprenticeship System was Rev. William Anderson, a GES committeeman and radical reformer. At a national public meeting held at Exeter Hall

³⁸³ *GESMB*, pp. 60-63 (9 June 1836), 71-64 (28 December 1835), 83-84 (3 March 1836), 84-86 (28 March 1836), 102-106 (13 March 1837), 111-116 (19 June 1837), 116-117 (31 October 1837), 119-136 (27 December 1837-2 August 1838)

³⁸⁴ GES, *Address of the Glasgow Emancipation Society-To the Friends of the Enslaved*, -----, *Second Annual Report*, pp. 3-6, 11, 16-20, *GESMB*, pp. 83-84 (3 March 1836), 84-86 (28 March 1836), *SIA*, "Address of the Glasgow Emancipation Society" (December, 1836), pp. 138-139

³⁸⁵ GES, *Second Annual Report*, pp. 19-20

³⁸⁶ *GESMB*, pp. 111-115 (19 June 1837)

on 23 November 1837, the Glasgow minister addressed the delegates, although not scheduled to do so. He pilloried the British government and West Indian party for privately colluding, while strenuously condemning the Abolition Act that made “the stolen man himself pay the price of his ransom.” The point of contention, according to Anderson, was not only about justice for the Negro, but also meant a vindication of British honour. He alluded to the long and strenuous struggle against the Glaswegian planter interest, commenting that,

In no quarter of the country had the friends of the negro had such a hard battle to fight, and in no place had they fought the battle so well, as in Scotland. Not long since, they were exposed to all sorts of abuse by the Colonial press in Glasgow. If a man spoke one word in favour of the negro, to such an extent was the system of persecution carried, that his friends must have compassion upon him; if he were a minister of the Gospel, when it was necessary that he should come forward on the Sabbath after the vile abuses cast upon him in the week. A few who were once united with the friends of Anti-slavery had succumbed, but the greater part had stood faithful, being persuaded that their cause was the cause of righteousness, and that it had the approbation of God.³⁸⁷

Anderson was not merely exaggerating the precarious position of various GES members; he was speaking from experience, especially since the society had lost some members who were subjected to abuse from powerful local pro-slavery interests.

The *North Wales Chronicle* and the *Scotsman* reported that Rev. Anderson, his fellow GES members, and other anti-slavery delegates, had met with an uncooperative Lord Melbourne. According to *NWC*, Anderson condemned Melbourne’s condescending behaviour, recalling how, “His Lordship seemed by the whole of his expression, as if he meant to say ‘I am perfectly sick of you.’ We retired, having gained none of his filthy treasury pensions, either for ourselves or our friends; but we left with a good conscience, with which few retire from his presence.”³⁸⁸ Anderson took the ministerial lead during this period. GES’s public meeting on 27 December 1837 was held in his chapel on John Street. The main speakers were Rev. Patrick Brewster, John Murray and George Thompson, as reported by the *Scotsman*. Rev. Brewster, a moral force Chartist enthusiast, also well

³⁸⁷ Central Negro Emancipation Committee, “A report of the proceedings of the public meeting held at Exeter Hall, on Thursday the 23rd of November, 1837,” in *British Emancipator* (London, 1837), pp. 1, 18-23. GES delegates also included: Rev. Patrick Brewster and John Dennistoun, MP.

³⁸⁸ GES, *Fourth Annual Report*, pp. 9-11, *GESMB*, pp. 118-119 (7, 27 December 1837), *North Wales Chronicle*, “The Premier and the Glasgow Anti-Slavery Delegates” (23 January 1838), *Scotsman*, “Public Meeting for the Abolition of the Apprenticeship System” (3 January 1838)

known for his outspoken opinions on slavery, likewise condemned the Act, demanding immediate abolition of the Apprenticeship system.

The planters have unwittingly, when they had the whole of the British nation bound at the feet in shackles of their own imposing, by the consent they gave to the iniquitous compensation clause, have, by a violation of that bargain, struck off their fetters, and enabled them to rise up in their might, and put an end for ever to the power and perpetrations of those guilty men.³⁸⁹

Not deterred, by early 1838, GES had enlisted the cooperation of Lord Henry Peter Brougham and John Dennistoun to present a petition to the House of Lords and Commons, respectively. The British government introduced palliative measures, given Royal sanction, aimed at extending Apprenticeship until 1840 to appease the West Indian interest. Brougham, who formerly supported gradualism, began advocating immediatism and, in a speech to the House of Lords, decried plans by the government and planters to extend Apprenticeship.³⁹⁰ The Glasgow society responded by organizing a large-scale “Anti-Slavery Crisis” public meeting on 16 April. The Glasgow committee united in campaigning against governmental and planter efforts to extend the Apprenticeship period, committing to the final abolition of Colonial slavery. The committee approved of a memorial to Parliament, on behalf of the inhabitants of Glasgow and the vicinity; and Rev. Anderson’s drafting of a memorial to Queen Victoria, exhorting her to support the abolition of the Apprenticeship scheme, so “it may be proclaimed that your Majesty is no longer a Queen of Slaves.” 135,000 Scottish females allegedly signed Rev. Anderson’s memorial to Queen Victoria, while GES reported that 102,100 men and women signed their petition to Parliament—the largest ever recorded for the Glasgow society and, most certainly, one of the largest ever produced in recent times. During this period, other British societies regarded GES as the leading abolitionist group in the fight against Apprenticeship.³⁹¹

The anti-slavery interest in Britain suffered several defeats within Parliament and,

³⁸⁹ *Scotsman*, “Public Meeting for the Abolition of the Apprenticeship System” (3 January 1838)

³⁹⁰ Henry Peter Brougham, “Speech of the Right Hon. Lord Brougham, on the Immediate Emancipation of the Negro Apprentices,” in *Speeches of eminent British statesmen during the thirty-nine years’ peace* (London, 1855), pp. 83-129, *GESMB*, pp. 126-131, (16 April 1838). Brougham shows as an official GES Honorary and Corresponding member as of 1838, see GES, *Fourth Annual Report*, p. 6

³⁹¹ BCLASS, *Statements Respecting the American Abolitionists* (Dublin, 1852), p. 48, GES, *Anti-slavery crisis* (Glasgow, 1838), reprinted from the *Glasgow Argus*, -----, *Fourth Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1838), pp. 13-14, 17-20. Anderson’s memorial was separate from one prepared by Heugh and Wardlaw.

correspondently, GES continued to arrange delegations to oppose Lord John Russell's measures to extend slavery in the West Indies. By 18 July 1838, however, news had reached the Glasgow that all West Indian island assemblies had agreed to abolish Apprenticeship by 1 August. Of course, GES noted this was not the end of British Colonial slavery, regretfully acknowledging the existence of East Indian enslavement, and vowed to join forces with the British and Foreign Aborigines Protection Society.³⁹² At the annual meeting, held on 2 August, the mood, although celebrating the end of West Indian slavery, was somber. GES committeemen criticized the British government, Parliament and even the Queen herself for obstructing emancipation. Rev. Anderson believed no credit should be given to the monarch, her cabinet or the Houses of Parliament, all of which hindered the cause. Instead, he said the victory had been achieved through the people. Thompson echoed Anderson's sentiments, criticizing the "Slavery-supporting and Abolition-obstructing Cabinet," although he refused to find fault with Victoria. Rev. Brewster concurred, yet, condemned Scottish MPs and ministers for their apathy during the height of the anti-Apprenticeship campaign, only coming out "too late to gain the victory, but to enjoy the triumph."³⁹³

In a soiree held the following evening, Dr. Heugh admitted that by congratulating the West Indian planters for emancipation, he differed with most anti-slavery adherents; however, he earnestly hoped that the abolition of the Apprenticeship would prove the deathblow to American slavery. GES members, in general, overwhelming disagreed with Heugh's sentiments, many still smarting from the twenty millions given to "manstealers" as compensation. To them the victory was bittersweet; it was only one of many hurdles still to cover in their quest for universal emancipation. As for America, GES resolved to continue aiding the AASS and hoped the end of Apprenticeship would bolster the US cause, which in recent times had endured severe censure and mob violence.³⁹⁴

End to the honeymoon—conflict, confusion and discord

On 1 August 1838, slavery officially terminated in the British West Indies along with the efforts of a certain segment of British anti-slavery. The British public was a fickle lot, just as in 1833, many sympathetic to the cause felt their duty was discharged, were unwilling to

³⁹² George Thompson, *First of August: Abolition of the apprenticeship* (Edinburgh, 1838), *GESMB*, pp. 130-134 (17 May 17 and 18 July 1838), 137-138 (2 August 1838), 141-143 (19 November 1838 and 13 May 1839), *GES, Fourth Annual Report*, pp. 14-15, 53-69

³⁹³ *GES, Fourth Annual Report*, pp. 27-44

³⁹⁴ *GES, Fourth Annual Report*, pp. 4, 44-52, *GESMB*, pp. 133-134 (2 August 1838)

continue working towards universal emancipation. This dismissive attitude resonated with Thomas B. Macaulay, Edinburgh MP, who believed his “especial obligations in respect to negro slavery ceased when slavery itself ceased in that part of the world for the welfare of which I, as a member of this House, was accountable.”³⁹⁵ Others, like George Stephen and his abolitionist colleagues, having spent decades campaigning against slavery, reluctantly bowed out, allowing the new generation to continue at the forefront.³⁹⁶ Nationally the London-based British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, founded in April 1839, reminded the public of its duty to tackle worldwide enslavement, a principle the Glasgow society was founded on six years earlier.³⁹⁷

In Scotland, Thompson called upon abolitionists to continue campaigning; not to dwell on successes, knowing full well slavery flourished elsewhere.³⁹⁸ Even the Glasgow Emancipation Society showed signs of disinterestedness. Despite their continual commitment to US abolition, as well as concerns for the escalating slave trade and its affect on Africa, the committee held only six meetings in 1839, two of which were public, committing a mere £176 towards anti-slavery efforts as opposed to the whopping £700 spent in the previous eighteen months. In reference to American slavery, the case of the *Amistad* captives and the Texan question had in the past garnered a certain degree of public attention. Certain committeemen, especially Murray and Smeal, however, diversified into other slavery-related causes, individually supporting other entities throughout Britain, such as Buxton’s inquiry into the slave trade, opponents of the Chinese opium market, and the Jamaican Negro legal assistance committee. After the end of Apprenticeship, GES lacked a clear focus and struggled to capture public awareness, utilizing divergent tactics to elicit further support.³⁹⁹

This lull in public anti-slavery support coincided with conflict amongst Glaswegian reform circles. From about 1839-42, there was a noted degree of discord between working class

³⁹⁵ In reference to British apathy following the 1833 Act of Abolition, see Chapter I; and post-1838, see Howard Temperley, *British Antislavery* (London, 1972), pp. xv, 63, Wesley, “The Abolition of Negro Apprenticeship,” pp. 158-159. Quoted from Temperley.

³⁹⁶ Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, p. 120, Stephen, *Recollections*, pp. 213-214

³⁹⁷ BFASS, *British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, for the abolition of slavery and the slave trade throughout the world. Address* (London, 1839)

³⁹⁸ George Thompson, *First of August*, pp. 19-20

³⁹⁹ Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, pp. 120-121, GES, *Fifth Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1839), pp. 19-28, 101-102, 103-110, *GESMB*, pp. 143 (13 May 1839), 145-146 (18 July 1839), 146 (31 July 1839), 148 (9 October 1839)—committee meetings, 146-148 (1 August 1839), 149-159 (15 October 1839)—public meetings. Expense figures quoted from Bingham’s report.

and middle class reformers.⁴⁰⁰ Although several GES members supported moral force Chartism, they also promoted the Anti-Corn Law Association, which at times refused to officially collaborate with the more popular Glasgow Universal Suffrage Association. The debate on the extent of franchise reforms, household versus universal, was the core issue. Rev. Brewster, William Craig, Alexander Hastie, John Fleming, and James Turner, in particular, were abolitionists willing to espouse more radical reforms, encompassing certain working class objectives; however, ACLA only wanted to promote class cooperation if it suited their interests. The political friction, at times, affected other sociopolitical causes, including abolition, when Chartists resorted to interrupting social meetings to plead their cause.⁴⁰¹

British India became the new abolitionist focus. For GES, the assumption of close cooperation with the British Aborigines Protection Society and later the British Indian Society served several purposes: firstly, it appealed to the benevolent, but at times insular, British anti-slavery public by reminding them of their moral duty to liberate all colonial slaves within the Empire; and secondly, it promoted the production of free-grown cotton, especially in India, to undermine American slavery, as well as Britain's increasing dependence on the US slave-grown product. This by no means meant GES had sidestepped its emphasis on Southern enslavement, instead the committee felt by addressing British India they could retain public interest and financial commitment for the anti-slavery cause.⁴⁰² Focusing on India diverted public attention and GES's efforts away from the contentious issue of church fellowship with US religious bodies and clerics tainted with slavery—the more conservative or moderate GES ministers, such as Heugh, King and Wardlaw, still resisting calls to excommunicate their American brethren.

It was soon apparent, though, that Indian question failed to revitalize British anti-slavery sentiment, suggesting other underlying issues were impeding the universal campaign, even in Glasgow. The society had in previous years commanded significant media attention, with lengthy articles covering their various meetings, yet, GES's cooperation with the British Aborigines Society gained little press. In a letter to BFASS member Henry Sterry,

⁴⁰⁰ Fiona Ann Montgomery, *Glasgow Radicalism 1830-1848* (PhD, University of Glasgow, 1974), pp. 188-199

⁴⁰¹ *GA*, "Glasgow Emancipation Society," (14 September 1840), *GESMB*, pp. 175-180 (7-10 August 1840)

⁴⁰² *GES*, *Fourth Annual Report*, pp. 53-69, -----, *Fifth Annual Report*, pp. 15-17, 25-27, 44, -----, *Sixth Annual Report*, pp. 10-12, *GESMB*, pp. 149-159 (15 October 1839), *GA*, "Junction between the Glasgow Emancipation Society, and the Aborigines Protection Society" (10 September 1838), *Scotsman*, "Glasgow Emancipation Society" (7 August 1839). Quote by John Murray.

Smeal mentioned he was disappointed in the apathetic response to British anti-slavery efforts.⁴⁰³ Garrison likewise questioned public reluctance in the UK to liberate India and pursue the production of free cotton, stating, “It seems very strange, nay, quite incomprehensible to me, that the abolitionists of England do not espouse the British India movement *en masse*.”⁴⁰⁴ Despite Murray and Smeal distributing numerous pamphlets and reports, including directly appealing to friends of GES, they were discouraged by the lack of enthusiasm, conceding that many had “settled down into a too self-satisfied state; as if, now that Slavery is entirely abolished in our West India Colonies, our work were finished.”⁴⁰⁵ Efforts to alleviate the British India situation were clearly influenced by resurgence franchise reform in Glasgow. Several stalwart GES members were keenly interested in extending suffrage and, undoubtedly, committed significant funds and time to renewed reform activities. A substantial number were also Repealers, opposed to the Corn Laws based on humanitarian and free trade merits. During this period, GES was consistently in debt, having to rely on pecuniary appeals through various religious entities.⁴⁰⁶

Plans for the General Anti-Slavery Convention in London reinvigorated British abolitionists. The *Emancipator*, an AASS paper, had first broached the idea in March 1839, and by July, BFASS issued invitations calling forth the “friends of the slave of every nation and of every clime.”⁴⁰⁷ The idea of an international conference galvanized Scottish abolitionists, especially Glaswegians. Eager to show their commitment, Murray and Smeal organized twenty-seven prominent local politicians, businessmen and members of clergy to represent GES, easily surpassing those from the EES and other regional British societies. Scottish poet Thomas Campbell also joined the conference. The committee believed the occasion provided “a powerful impetus to the Abolition Cause throughout the world...and [would] rekindle the zeal of those who have hitherto, laboured for the oppressed.”⁴⁰⁸

⁴⁰³ *Scotsman*, “Glasgow Aborigines Protection Society (26 October 1839), Smeal to Henry Sterry (22 January 1840), quoted in Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, p. 121

⁴⁰⁴ Garrison to J. Pease (1 September 1840), in Taylor, *BAA*, pp. 112-113. Pease founded the British India Society (BIS).

⁴⁰⁵ GES, *Sixth Annual Report*, pp. 10-11. The bulk of these items were distributed in December 1839.

⁴⁰⁶ GES, *Circular to the Members and Friends of the Glasgow Emancipation Society* (Glasgow, 1839), -----, *Fourth Annual Report*, p. 31, -----, *Fifth Annual Report*, p. 28, 45, -----, *Sixth Annual Report*, p. 11, -----, *Seventh Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1841), p. 9, *GESMB*, pp. 137-140 (2 August 1838), 157 (15 October 1839). GES was consistently in debt from late 1839 to 1841.

⁴⁰⁷ *Emancipator* (28 March 1839) information taken from Maynard, “World’s Anti-Slavery Convention,” p. 453

⁴⁰⁸ BFASS, *Proceedings of the General Anti-Slavery Convention* (London, 1841), pp. 573-584, Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, pp. 123, 127, 273, GES, *Fourth Annual Report*, pp. 11, -

Another, more potent, incentive for GES to send a large number of delegates was to assert its own position within British anti-slavery circles.

The Glasgow association, a frontrunner well before BFASS, originally founded with the premise of tackling universal slavery, especially in America; addressing numerous US slave-related concerns, such as the Texas question. GES also supported efforts to improve Africa and India, both commercially and socially, a prospect the national society tended to downplay. Smeal, as well as other older abolitionists—Thomas Buxton and George Stephen, questioned the London upstarts' expectation of predominance over all other pre-existing anti-slavery societies in Britain; and politely reminded them of GES's accomplishments in the field, thus far. The Glasgow committee retained their autonomy, yet, was willing to cooperate with BFASS insofar as their measures harmonized with that of GES.⁴⁰⁹ In this sense the committee was not being insular and difficult; this was not an issue of Scottish antagonism towards their English counterparts. GES's funding and prestige could not match the more affluent BFASS, but they were consistently active and engaged, in some respects more so than the London committee, which founded in 1839, espousing slavery issues GES had already addressed several years earlier. The Glasgow society was not alone in their opposition to various BFASS policies either, which reflected wider divisions in the British anti-slavery community.⁴¹⁰

The "World's" convention, in some respects, proved tempestuous, unearthing various points of contention, not only amongst the American delegates but also within British anti-slavery circles. At home, disagreements between BFASS and the African Civilization Society (often compared with the detested American Civilization Society), forced Buxton to publicly exonerate himself of impropriety. BFASS, especially Scoble and Sturge, had openly and privately opposed Buxton's scheme, even successfully enlisting support from the seceding American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. Correspondence between Lewis

-----, *Sixth Annual Report*, pp. 17-18, *GESMB*, pp. 158-160 (9-10 January 1840), 170-171 (1 June 1840)

⁴⁰⁹ Smeal to Scoble (1 January 1840) in Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, pp. 121-122, *GESMB*, pp. 146-147 (1 August 1839), 149-156 (15 October 1839), 158-160 (9-10 January 1840, *Scotsman*, "Glasgow Aborigines Protection Society" (26 October 1839)

⁴¹⁰ Stephen, *Recollections*, pp. 213-214, Temperely, *British Antislavery*, pp. 64-68. Stephen also depreciated the new organization, stating BFASS "consisted then...of men utterly unknown in the great Antislavery battle." Temperely contended this attitude was prevalent amongst opponents to BFASS's policies, although the society retained several previous abolitionists, in name only. Stephen's opinion, though, does highlight discrepancies between the old and new societies—i.e. those abolitionists, such as Buxton, that gave sanction to BFASS but publicly disagreed on various stratagems.

Tappan, Joshua Leavitt, and Joseph Sturge, suggests BFASS's disapproval of Buxton's African improvement schemes was common knowledge in US abolitionist circles.⁴¹¹ At the convention, Buxton's request to address the assembly on Africa was objected to and withdrawn. Justice John Jeremy, who supported Buxton's proposals, submitted to the convention GES's plan for protecting Africans and liberated slaves under international law, written by John Murray, and seconded by Rev. J. Carlile. In line with the African Civilization committee, Murray's project addressed concerns for the welfare and protection of free Africa. Yet, without explanation, the chairman, William T. Blair of Bath, dismissed GES's proposal, deferring to the judgment of BFASS, who later tabled the paper without incident. Despite regional and national abolitionists calling for anti-slavery policies to secure Africa from further ruin, the London society seemed adamant in crushing Buxton's plans, as well as others associated with him.⁴¹²

BFASS's manipulation of anti-slavery issues did not stop there. BIS, likewise supported by GES, looked to address problems within the British Empire, although Broad Street focused mainly on worldwide slavery and the slave trade. When Thomas Clarkson's opening speech prioritized British India as a possible commercial antagonist to Southern cotton, BFASS initially suppressed his remarks from publication. GES, who supported the concept of free-grown Indian cotton, protested against editing by BFASS of Clarkson's speech, as evidenced in their 1841 edition. A copy of Clarkson's complete speech was reprinted by the society with his permission. Long discussions concerning the promotion of free labour, especially in India, divided opinion and, despite resolutions encouraging such, the convention remained deadlocked, failing to agree on any direct statement against the usage of slave-grown products.⁴¹³ This may have had something to do with BFASS's

⁴¹¹ BFASS, *Proceedings*, pp. 242-246, *Essex Standard*, "Prospectus of the Society for the Extinction of the Slave Trade, and for the Colonization of Africa" (17 April 1840), Joshua Leavitt to Sturge (5 July 1839) and Lewis Tappan to Sturge (14 December 1839), in Annie H. Abel and Frank Klingberg, *A Side-light on Anglo-American Relations* (Lancaster, 1927), pp. 52-55, 64-67, including p. 53 (fn 5), Lucretia Mott, "Slavery and 'The Woman Question,'" Lucretia Mott's diary of her visit to Great Britain to attend the World's Anti-Slavery Convention," ed. Frederick B. Tolles, *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* (London, 1952), pp. 37-38, Stephen, *Recollections*, pp. 213-214

⁴¹² BFASS, *Proceedings*, pp. 507-508, 550-551, Alexandra Franklin, "Jeremie, Sir John (1795-1841)," *ODNB* (Oxford, 2004) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14773, GES, *Eighth Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1842), pp. 31-86, Jeremie to Buxton (11 June 1840) quoted in John Jeremie, *A letter to T. Fowell Buxton, Esq. on Negro emancipation and African civilization* (London, 1840), pp. 5-32, J. A. Collins to M. W. Chapman (3 December 1840), in Taylor, *BAA*, p. 131, *Morning Chronicle*, "Anti-Slavery Convention" (18 June 1840), *Scotsman*, "Anti-Slavery Delegation" (24 June 1840)

⁴¹³ BFASS, *Proceedings*, pp. 2-3, 430-432, 437-447, GES, *Sixth Annual Report*, pp. 18, 26-28, Maynard, "World's Anti-Slavery Convention," pp. 461-462, David Turley, *The Culture of English Antislavery* (London, 1991), p. 125, Charles Swaisland, "The Aborigines Protection Society, 1837-

support for West Indian sugar planters, in opposition to government plans to reduce foreign sugar duties. Liberals, in general, wanted a reduction in sugar duties for two reasons: one, they felt an open world market for free grown products would competitively drive out the slave-grown product; secondly, as with corn laws, they felt duties discriminated against the poor and working classes who could not afford sugar. Several British anti-slavery societies, including GES, supported the government's plan, opposing BFASS's seemingly underhanded collusion with the West Indian interest.⁴¹⁴

Church fellowship was another controversial issue, commanding several days' attention. In the past, GES helped organize addresses to American church bodies over slavery and, at times, intimated Christian fellowship should cease. At the convention, though, several British ministerial delegates argued against any direct interference in church discipline, although most supported the idea of remonstrating with their brethren and agreed to adopt a resolution declaring slavery as a sin against God. Once again, British anti-slavery demonstrated a penchant for compromise in relation to their American allies, showing its unique weakness in relation to the fight against US slavery. The Quaker-led BFASS was no different, reacting to a conservative upswing in anti-abolitionist feeling within American orthodox Quaker circles. The movement in Britain, in general, sought the support of religious entities, yet these same bodies were "officially" reluctant to excommunicate or sever ties with their American brethren, although several regional groups made pledges to reject communion. The pressure to conform meant British ministers publicly in favour of no fellowship were often marginalized and pressured from within, as in the case of Rev. Price, editor of *Slavery in America*, who was forced to quit the journal.⁴¹⁵

Despite this, the Glasgow delegates supported the original, more authoritative measures against Christian collusion with slavery against the general consensus of the convention. American Rev. Nathaniel Colver was keen to repress any aggressive language in the resolutions and objected to the convention dictating stateside church policies. One British

1909," in *After Slavery: Emancipation and its Discontents*, ed. Howard Temperley (London, 2000), p. 265. BFASS later seemingly supported the proposition; however, at the time of the convention, the society competed with not only the BIS, but the Aborigines Protection Society for public interest. Clarkson's focus on British India perhaps threatened BFASS's own agenda.

⁴¹⁴ *GESMB*, pp. 208-209 (18 June 1841), *Morning Chronicle*, "Reduction on Duty on Sugar," (July 10, 1840), "Unauthorised Conduct of the Treasurer of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society," (May, 20, 1841), *Morning Post*, "The Edinburgh Review and Sir R. Peel and Sugar and Slavery," (24 July 1841)

⁴¹⁵ *SIA*, "The Editor's Address to the Reader," 1 (July 1836), pp. 1-3, "Address from the NY Orthodox Quakers on Slavery," IX (March 1837), pp. 193-196

delegate, Dr. Hoby, who GES criticized for pandering to US Southern churches, refused to sanction any motion upholding excommunication of Christians over slavery. Rev. Young sided with his countryman, believing the convention had no right to interfere with a church and its discipline. Speaking on behalf of GES, Rev. A. Harvey emphatically declared that every Christian had the right to remonstrate against another who violated the law of God, especially in relation to slavery. Harvey, along with Murray, Smeal and the other GES members were united in this viewpoint, which was likewise supported by GES affiliates, Thompson and O'Connell.⁴¹⁶

The debate over the admission of female representatives from Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, however, provoked the most vehement discussions. Wendell Phillips's (AASS representative) motion in favour of female participation was strongly advocated by US delegates Professor William Adam, George Bradburn, James Canning Fuller and Colonel Jonathan P. Miller, along with British note-worthies William H. Ashurst and Dr. John Bowring. Professor Adam from MASS, not Garrison (who had yet to arrive), first suggested he would not participate if the females were not acknowledged, believing their credentials as abolitionists should suffice. Even Dr. Bowring of Exeter questioned the excuse of British "customs and usage" as a barrier since Britain was ruled by a female monarch and Quakers, who were associated with anti-slavery, in particular, gave women positions of prominence within their church. In his opinion, a committee should be appointed to consider the matter, which he approved of.⁴¹⁷

Unbeknownst to most attendees, though, was the collusion between the newly formed AFASS's James G. Birney, Joseph Leavitt, Lewis Tappan and Henry B. Stanton, and BFASS. In 1839 Scoble visited the US, travelling with Charles Stuart and spending a considerable amount of time with Tappan; both men adamantly against the "Woman Question."⁴¹⁸ Sturge, on the other hand, did not want the American controversy to disrupt convention proceedings. The London committee and their adherents held strong feelings against the inclusion of women into the public sphere of men and, after forewarning from

⁴¹⁶ BFASS, *Proceedings*, pp. 47-76, 267-301, *CM*, "Anti-Slavery Convention" (22 June 1840), Maynard, "World's Anti-Slavery Convention," p. 461, *Scotsman*, "General Anti-Slavery Convention" (20 June 1840)

⁴¹⁷ *Belfast Newsletter*, "General Anti-Slavery Convention" (19 June 1840), *Scotsman*, "General Anti-Slavery Convention" (20 June 1840), BFASS, *Proceedings*, pp. 23-46

⁴¹⁸ Birney to Amos A. Phelps (8 August 1839), in Birney, *Letters*, I, pp. 497-498, L. Tappan to Scoble (December 10, 1839), in Abel and Klingberg, *Side-light*, pp. 60-63, Kathryn Kish Sklar, "Women Who Speak for an Entire Nation": American and British Women Compared at the World Anti-Slavery Convention, London, 1840," *Pacific Historical Review*, 59:4 (November, 1990), p. 462, Garrison to Oliver Johnson (5 August 1839), in WLG, *Letters*, II, pp. 523-528

Stuart and Tappan, reissued statements clarifying their stance. Lucretia Mott quickly deduced that the AFASS's opinion had already prejudiced BFASS, who were determined "to act with our New Organization, therefore, all reasoning was lost...our appeals made in vain."⁴¹⁹ Correspondence confirmed Leavitt had met with Sturge prior to the convention to consider forming an Anglo-American anti-slavery coalition. After the conference, Scoble toured the UK with Birney and Stanton, promoting the AFASS.⁴²⁰

The "Woman question" and Garrison's support thereof was often blamed for the divisions amongst the American abolitionists; yet, this was merely a front disguising several other grievances. Birney blamed "promiscuous female representation" for disunion, which, coupled with other sociopolitical issues, complicated the anti-slavery cause. Much of the literature concerning the American divisions tends to focus on Garrison's ideology and methodology, which clashed with more moderate or conservative abolitionists, including orthodox clergy. In this particular instance, although Garrison had urged delegates like Bradburn to uphold women's rights, Phillips acted upon his own volition. At times he differed with Garrison's ideas, such as no-human government, yet forcefully advocated women participation in anti-slavery. Birney, on the other hand, used the "Woman Question" to waylay attention away from his own divisive actions. A study of his personal letters, from late 1839 to mid-1840, showed many of his personal friends opposed political action, believing it would create a third abolition party and divide the cause.⁴²¹

Phillips was irked that Birney used the woman debate to publicly denounce the Old organization as a women's rights party, non-resistance and no-government sect. More importantly, though, he reminded Birney, currently the Liberty Party presidential candidate, that political action likewise caused mayhem within MASS and AASS circles. Canadian abolitionist Dr. Thomas Rolph sympathized with the women delegates, yet,

⁴¹⁹ Maynard, "World's Anti-Slavery Convention," p. 457, James and Lucretia Mott, *James and Lucretia Mott. Life and letters*, ed., Anna D. Hallowell (Boston, 1884), p. 150, Mott, *Diary*, p. 27, Sklar, "Women Who Speak for an Entire Nation," pp. 462-464

⁴²⁰ Birney to Tappan (23 July 1840), in Birney, *Letters*, I, pp. 583-585, Leavitt to William Jay (2 July 1840), in Stephen P. Budney, *William Jay* (Westport, 2005), pp. 57 (fn 9), 146

⁴²¹ Birney, *Letters*, I, pp. 508-574. For various opinions on the US split, including the role of the orthodoxy clergy: Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, pp. 123-126, Budney, *William Jay*, pp. 55-83, Christopher Clark, *The communitarian moment* (Ithaca, 1995), pp. 34-38, William Goodell, *Slavery and Anti-slavery* (New York, 1855), pp. 457-467, Donald R. Kennon, "'An apple of discord': The woman question at the world's anti-slavery convention of 1840," *Slavery & Abolition*, 5:3 (December 1984), pp. 244-247, Maynard, "World's Anti-Slavery Convention," pp. 457-458, Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, pp. 80-99, Ripley, *Black Abolitionist Papers*, I, pp. 16-17, Sklar, "Women Who Speak for an Entire Nation," p. 459.

cautioned against seemingly siding with one party or another—"It must be remembered that this is a question on which America is undecided, and the decision of the subject by this Convention would impose upon us the invidious office of umpire between two contending parties in that country."⁴²²

BFASS and assembled delegates overwhelmingly decided against Phillips's motion to include women.⁴²³ Garrison, who arrived on 17 June, five days into the proceedings, boycotted the decision by not participating in the conference, along with fellow Americans Professor Adams, Charles Lenox Remond, and Nathaniel P. Rogers. Remond's letter to the *Colored American* explained his decision:

The British and Foreign Anti Slavery Society (not World's Convention) as we had fondly and anxiously anticipated...on my arrival I learned with much sorrow of the rejection of the female delegation, I need not mention. And in few instances through life have I met with greater disappointment...I have yet to learn, that the emancipation of the American slave, from the sepulcher of American slavery, is not of more importance than the rejection of females from the platform of any Anti Slavery Society, Convention, or Conference.⁴²⁴

On behalf of MASS's women, Phillips submitted a formal Protest against the exclusion. American Rev. Colver and Scoble counter-motoned and the document was tabled. BFASS, of course, refused to officially record the matter in their proceedings. Afterwards the London Committee held a public anti-slavery meeting at Exeter Hall on 24 June. AFASS reps Birney and Stanton held participatory roles, while Garrison and his cohorts were excluded from speaking. The American women were again denied access, although BFASS made exceptions, as always, for English ladies of especial distinction, allowing the Duchess of Sutherland and Elizabeth Fry honorary seats on the platform alongside the men. Lucretia Mott found BFASS's policy against female participation, "rather inconsistent, after their repudiating 'such exposure of ladies.'"⁴²⁵

The Glasgow Emancipation Society delegates differed on the propriety of female

⁴²² Susan B. Anthony, Matilda J. Gage, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, *History of Woman Suffrage*, I (Rochester, 1887), pp. 50-62, 417-420, BFASS, *Proceedings*, pp. 27-28, 41-42, 45

⁴²³ BFASS, *Proceedings*, p. 45, *Belfast Newsletter*, "General Anti-Slavery Convention" (19 June 1840), Garrison to Edmund Quincy (13 and 30 June 1840), in WLJ, *Letters*, II, pp. 639-641, *Scotsman*, "General Anti-Slavery Convention" (20 June 1840)

⁴²⁴ Archibald H. Grimke, *William Lloyd Garrison* (New York, 1891), pp. 292-305, Remond to Charles B. Ray (30 June 1840), in Ripley, *Black Abolitionist Papers*, I, pp. 71-74

⁴²⁵ BFASS, *Proceedings*, p. 564, Garrison to Helen Garrison (29 June 1840), Garrison to Oliver Johnson (3 July 1840), in WLJ, *Letters*, II, pp. 654-656, 666, Maynard, "World's Anti-Slavery Convention," pp. 464-465, L. Mott, *Diary*, p. 45

inclusion. Rev. Harvey publicly praised the American women for their forthright endeavors but insisted they should operate within their respective sphere. He acknowledged his opinion was personal and based upon his religious principles, but conceded he may be wrong, unlike the dogmatic US representatives Birney and Rev. Henry Grew. George Thompson, who represented EES and GES, criticized opposition arguments utilizing English customs and propriety, exalting the anti-slavery endeavors of the American females. His resolve floundered in the end, though, and he requested Phillips withdraw the motion, although he later came forth as one of the most fervent supporters of female participation. On the other hand, Murray and Smeal were equally disgusted with BFASS's seemingly biased policy. Murray felt no committee or convention had the right to exclude anyone based on their "Sect, Sex, colour or breed, but only upon qualifications of their credentials." Smeal, in particular, was incensed by BFASS's stance against the female delegates and made his feelings known to Scoble.⁴²⁶

In many respects, the issue of female inclusion had more to do with the old issue of class conflict, the debate over inclusion and human rights, than anything else. Murray and Smeal viewed the exclusion of the American, mainly Hicksite, females as yet another way for the upper classes to disbar others from taking their rightful place in society. The London committee, dominated by wealthy orthodox Quakers, habitually courted aristocrats and royalty to adorn their meetings and bolster their prestige. The mostly middle-class GES members were wary of such unauthentic displays of authority. The inclusion of affluent women, such as the Duchess of Sutherland, at BFASS public events merely reinforced the inequity. Quaker Smeal, whose sister and niece led the Edinburgh lady abolitionists, assured Lucretia Mott that the exclusion of women from the Convention would not be tolerated in Scotland.⁴²⁷

Outwardly, the Glasgow society appeared unified and, to the average passer-by, seemingly embraced both the "Old" and "New" American abolitionists with equal regard. GES, especially Murray and Smeal, had, at this point, no reason to discredit or rebuff either AASS's Garrisonians or AFASS's Tappanite men. One would suggest that Victorian

⁴²⁶ BFASS, *Proceedings*, pp. 27, 32-38, 41-42, L. Mott, *Diary*, p. 27, Murray to John H. Tredgold, BFASS secretary (9 September 1841), in Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, p. 131

⁴²⁷ J. L. Mott, *Life and Letters*, p. 176, L. Mott, *Diary*, p. 66, Scoble to Tredgold (14 October 1840), in Abel and Klingberg, *Side-light*, p. 73. Smeal's sister, Jane Smeal Wigham, was married to an EES committee member, John Wigham. Eliza Wigham was Jane's stepdaughter. Before marrying Wigham, Jane worked on the Glasgow Ladies Emancipation Society. Both her and Eliza later became the corner-stone of Edinburgh female abolitionism, see Clare Midgley, *Women against slavery*, pp. 51, 79-85, 135-139, 158

social etiquette demanded dignified public behavior, even amongst adversaries. To air one's "dirty laundry" in public, per se, degraded one's character in society and brought disrepute to their organization.⁴²⁸ More importantly, GES's constitution mirrored that of the original US society, which welcomed "*all friendly to its Object.*" Therefore, it is not surprising to see that Birney, Garrison and Stanton were all hailed by GES, including neighboring Edinburgh, and treated to grand public meetings and breakfasts.⁴²⁹ This, however, merely disguised other social and cultural polemics that would later rupture the Glasgow association.

The New organization, with the help of BFASS, swiftly influenced British abolitionist opinion against Garrison and his adherents. Soon after the convention, news spread that English abolitionists, in particular, severed ties with the AASS, committing themselves to the new AFASS agenda. Worst yet, Garrison's character was attacked, condemned and marginalized for his opinions on other extraneous issues—non-resistance, women rights, etc.—many choosing to cease all intercourse with him.⁴³⁰ During that same period, Birney wrote to L. Tappan about plans to tour the UK with Scoble targeting the "considerate class" of BFASS and their constituents.⁴³¹ Securing AFASS vital support from eminent British anti-slavery circles was paramount to the respectability and survival of the new society; neutralizing the legitimacy of AASS was patently key to this plan. AFASS's main British ally was Scoble, who, as a close friend of Tappan, admittedly circulated calumnious rumors concerning Garrison and AASS in private, a charge he was later publicly condemned for.⁴³² It is clear from this admission that Scoble went to great lengths to discredit the old society within private anti-slavery circles partial to the London

⁴²⁸ Harriet Martineau to Collins (9 November 1840), in Taylor, *BAA*, p. 123. Martineau initially stood back from the controversy, believing the American cause had been degraded by quarreling and, as such, was alienating those previously inclined to support it.

⁴²⁹ Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, pp. 132-136, 141, GES, *Report of Discussion on recent disputes in society* (Glasgow, 1841), pp. 15-16, -----, *Seventh Annual Report*, p. 23, *GESMB*, II, pp. 173-174 (27 July 1840), 180-182 (20 October 1840), Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, pp. 94-99. Smeal's speech in *Discussion* reiterated their attitude was to embrace all US delegates, despite disputes, as anti-slavery brethren.

⁴³⁰ E. Pease to unknown recipient (17 July 1840) and E. Pease to Garrison (18 July 1840), in Taylor, *BAA*, pp. 101-102

⁴³¹ Birney to L. Tappan (23 July 1840), in Birney, *Letters*, I, pp. 583-585

⁴³² BCLASS, *Statements respecting the American Abolitionists*, pp. 3-5, Lewis Tappan, *Reply to charges brought against the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society* (London, 1852), pp. 3-7, Edmund Quincy, *An examination of the charges of Mr. John Scoble & Mr. Lewis Tappan against the American Anti-Slavery Society* (Dublin, 1852), p. 17. Prior to the convention, Birney had expressed some misgivings about Scoble's ability to handle the AASS-AFASS controversy in an appropriate manner, see, Birney to Amos A. Phelps (8 August 1839), in Birney, *Letters*, I, pp. 497-498. Both works against Scoble and Tappan were printed in Dublin by Richard Webb, Irish abolitionist and loyal Garrisonian supporter.

committee. Character assassination amongst one's social connections held great sway in Victorian society, especially amongst the upper classes, and could easily ruin a person's reputation. Nonetheless, GES, under the administration of Murray and Smeal, maintained its autonomy from BFASS, and would not willingly dismiss AASS. Those members of GES partial to Broad Street, though, would only learn of Garrison's more serious "transgressions" later that year, well after the American had left the UK.

In various discussions concerning the divisions of GES, Bingham and Rice failed to include this aspect of the controversy. Both historians view the arrival of AASS's agent John A. Collins as the turning point in the affairs of the Glasgow society when, in fact, there were signs of discord well beforehand.⁴³³ Elizabeth Pease, daughter of Joseph, had high hopes that Scottish abolitionists would embrace the Garrisonians in, "a more *free* & genial atmosphere than they did here, where the murky mists of prejudice obscure the discernment ever, of what is *due* men who have sacrificed so much & come so far to advocate the cause of the slave."⁴³⁴ As Pease's letter indicates, class pretensions were the core problem. Britain was still very much a hierarchical society; Victorian norms still dictated one's ability to move within certain social groups. Garrison and his followers, with the exception of Wendell Phillips and a few others, came from more humble backgrounds than that of their British peers in London. Tensions between orthodox and Hicksite Quakers did not aid in their acceptance either.

After the convention, Garrison was honoured by GES with a large public meeting at Dr. Wardlaw's chapel on 27 July 1840. Wardlaw and other clerical members abundantly praised Garrison and welcomed his cohorts—Professor Adam, C. L. Remond, and N. P. Rodgers, those Americans who protested against the exclusion of women—seemingly unaware of the storm surrounding AASS's figurehead. Rev. Harvey, who sided with BFASS's decision to prohibit female participation, undoubtedly enlightened the committee on Garrisons pro-women views. Dr. Heugh, one of the later detractors of AASS, acknowledged his awareness of the "Woman Question" at the conference, which divided GES delegates. Both Harvey and Heugh were conspicuously absent from the gathering honouring Garrison. During the meeting, the audience approved of Garrison's critique of the London Convention, as one, "that would admit only one-half of the world, could not be

⁴³³ Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, pp. 125-126, 142-157, Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, pp. 88-90, 99-111

⁴³⁴ E. Pease to unknown recipient (17 July 1840), in Taylor, *BAA*, pp. 101-102

the World's Convention."⁴³⁵ Thompson likewise managed to get his motion favouring the American women approved, although the rhetoric steered well clear of the "Woman Question." Wardlaw, who firmly rejected any notion of women's rights, at one point, though, made his excuses and left the chair.⁴³⁶

Smeal and Wardlaw, however, soon came to loggerheads over the possible involvement of American women and the Motts, well-known Hicksite abolitionists, at GES's annual assembly. In a private letter to Smeal, the Doctor depreciated the repeated allusions to female participation made during the meeting to honour Garrison. In turn, Smeal wrote Garrison appraising him of the situation and, despite the anticipated opposition from Wardlaw and others on the committee, he still hoped that James and Lucretia Mott, as well as the other women delegates (also Hicksites), would be publicly welcomed and allowed to speak at the meeting.⁴³⁷ Murray, Smeal and Thompson, along with those who supported the females, were apparently stonewalled, and the committee voted against the measure. The annual event, held at Wardlaw's chapel, excluded the Motts from the platform, and they were not officially acknowledged. Lucretia Mott, who had assurances from Smeal that GES would be more understanding to female anti-slavery action, was not allowed to address the audience by the chairman, Dr. Heugh.⁴³⁸ Wardlaw likewise proffered a motion, seconded by Robert Kettle, contesting the *Sixth Annual Report* prepared by Murray and Smeal, which denounced BFASS for refusing to allow the women delegates; siding with AASS over the controversy.⁴³⁹

The attention paid to Garrison seems disingenuous considering GES's conflict over the woman question. However, as a quasi-political figure, who attracted large audiences of all ranks, especially reformers, it was important for the Glasgow committee to acknowledge

⁴³⁵ GES, *Report of the Speeches, and Reception of the American Delegates* (Glasgow, 1840), pp. 9-11, *GESMB*, pp. 173-174 (27 July 1840), Dr. Heugh to Murray and Smeal (24 February 1841), in GES, *Resolutions of Public Meeting of the Members and Friends of the Glasgow Emancipation Society...since the arrival in Glasgow, of J. A. Collins, the representative of the American Anti-Slavery Association, in reference to the divisions among American Abolitionists* (Glasgow, 1841), pp. 20-21

⁴³⁶ GES, *Reception of the American Delegates*, pp. 23-24, -----, *Sixth Annual Report*, p. 12, *Scotsman*, "Anti-Slavery Meeting" (5 August 1840)

⁴³⁷ Smeal to Garrison (1 August 1840), in Taylor, *BAA*, p. 105

⁴³⁸ James Mott, *Three Months in Great Britain*, pp. 64-69, J. and L. Mott, *Life and Letters*, p. 171, 176, L. Mott, *Diary*, pp. 68. *Life and Letters* contains a reprint of the *Christian Pioneer* (September, 1840), edited by Unitarian George Harris, which lambasted GES and, especially, Wardlaw for avoiding the Garrisonians.

⁴³⁹ Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, pp. 136-137, GES, *Sixth Annual Report*, p. 4, *GESMB*, p. 175 (7 August 1840). This appears to be the first time any committee member opposed the annual report.

him. Besides, a large portion of the committee were receptive to many of his “extraneous” sociopolitical ideas—complete franchise and peace principles, in particular; while others viewed him as the legitimate leader of the US abolition movement, despite his idiosyncrasies. More importantly, Garrison’s absolutist anti-slavery ideology was right in line with the general consensus of GES.

Nonetheless, by the time Birney, Scoble and Stanton arrived (October 1840), certain elements of the Glasgow committee had already developed a negative view of Garrison’s ideas. Birney cleverly used Garrison’s backing of women’s rights, his alleged infidel religious views, and other politically nonconformist ideas, to discredit the AASS President. During this period, moderate British reformers were hesitant to engage other radical British movements, like Chartism and the Irish question, which threatened anti-slavery cohesion.⁴⁴⁰ Garrison’s views on female rights and his sympathy for the British working class certainly did not endear him to the more conservative members of GES—these were the least of his worries; whereas charges of fanaticism and infidelity ultimately would destroy his credibility amongst the more prominent Glaswegian abolitionists.

Since 1837, Birney, Stanton, and L. Tappan conspired against Garrison hoping to cripple his influence within the emancipation cause. Again, their motives were partially due to differing abolitionist agendas, methods and ideology—Garrison was more radical and willing to embrace other sociopolitical issues; while Tappan’s group remained moderate, almost conservative in action and in relation to other reform movements. Still, there remained some element of personal antipathy towards Garrison, which, by mid-1839, snowballed in light of Garrison’s forceful opposition to political action. Garrison was an easy target to expose and discredit. Unlike his fellow AASS associate Wendell Phillips, he came from a humble, lower class upbringing that lacked formal education and social standing. Both Garrison and Phillips espoused radical ideas, yet, the more prominent Harvard attorney, Phillips, did not suffer the same social pillorying that Garrison experienced. Birney and Stanton wanted Garrison “amputated” from anti-slavery cause, scurrilously branding his cohorts as “Garrisonites.” Tappan refused to defend Garrison against the Clerical Appeal and later, in 1839, colluded with Scoble over the “Woman Question.” Tappan, at this time, did not approve of abolitionist political action but still sided with Birney and Stanton.

⁴⁴⁰ Kennon, “An apple of discord,” p. 253, Scoble to Tredgold (14, 15, 21, 30 October 1840), in Abel and Klingberg, *Sidelight*, pp. 73-76

Garrison remained well aware of assaults to his character, credibility and standing, which paralleled Birney, Stanton, and Tappan's turn against him, as documented in their letters. Close associates of Birney dismissed accusations leveled at Garrison for splitting the US movement. Rev. Green, a long-term friend of Birney, believed Garrisonians were not chiefly to blame for issues leading to divisions. F. J. Lemoyne, who declined the political nomination alongside Birney, advised his friend not to cloud the matter; the focus on women's rights was a false issue. Charles Tappan, a relation of Lewis, allegedly admitted that the sole object of AFASS was "to put down Garrison." Another documented source in Tappan's correspondence suggested one way for Americans to create prejudice in England against certain abolitionists was to label them "fanatics."⁴⁴¹ Rightly or wrongly, what ensued was a systematic attack on Garrison, aimed at stigmatizing his character within the Anglo-American abolitionist network. Persons associated directly with Garrison, including those who defended him, also suffered. Black abolitionist Remond, who toured Britain independently of AASS, refused to ally himself with AFASS and, in consequence, "cut himself off *very much* from the sympathies of a large class of 'abolitionists.'"⁴⁴²

Collins' arrival in Britain on a mission for AASS coincided with AFASS's October meetings in Scotland. Due to financial constraints brought on by divisions in the cause and the economic downturn, AASS's Executive Committee sent Collins to appeal to British colleagues for financial assistance. Their petition avoided reference to the discomfiting debate about American abolitionist discord, hoping long-term UK affiliations would render aid to the society, and Collins initially restrained his commentary on the matter. Collins first stayed with Thompson in Edinburgh. Thompson suggested Collins tour with Remond avoiding "controverted topics...as though no prejudice existed." Only later did Collins publicly expose the issue in his *Right and Wrong*, which was published by GES affiliate George Gallie. Old American society members, including Garrison, knew Tappanite

⁴⁴¹ Gamaliel Bailey to Birney (28 November 1839), Birney to L. Tappan (14 September 1837), Birney to Phelps (8 August 1839), (4 February 1840), Francis J. LeMoyne to Birney (24 March 1840), Rev. Beriah Green to Birney (27 February 1840), Stanton to Birney (7 August 1837), (1 September 1837), (21 March 1840), in Birney, *Letters*, I, pp. 404-412, 420-425, 497-498, 508-510, 525-527, 533-535, 541-545, Francis Jackson to US Abolitionists (24 April 1840), Garrison to George W. Benson (26 August 1837), (16 September 1837), Garrison to L. Tappan (13 September 1837), Garrison to *Liberator* (31 May 1839), Garrison to E. Pease (6 November 1837), Garrison to N. P. Rodgers (21 May 1839), in WLJ, *Letters*, II, pp. 290-291, 298-304, 323-327, 461-86, 577-587, L. Tappan to Scoble (10 December 1839), (5 May 1840), in Abel and Klingberg, *Sidelight*, pp. 60-63, 67 (fn. 28), 69-70, L. Tappan to Sturge (5 July 1839), in Lewis Tappan, "Correspondence of Lewis Tappan and Others with the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society [Part 1]," *Journal of Negro History*, 12:2 (April, 1927), pp. 179-180 (fn. 2)

⁴⁴² Garrison to Henry C. Wright (August, 1840), in Taylor, *BAA*, p. 111, Remond to Richard Allen (7 January 1841) and Remond to Garrison (7 March 1841), in Ripley, *Black Abolitionist Papers*, I, pp. 7-8, 85-88, 92-965

proponents would prejudice the mission, with direct collusion from BFASS. William Bassett, MASS, hoped Collins visit may, “do much to promote a more perfect understanding of the true nature of the difficulties subsisting here among the professed friends of Emancipation...they are more likely to be misrepresented by the committee of [the] British & Foreign A.S. Society.”⁴⁴³

In a letter to E. Pease, Garrison expressed doubts concerning the prospects of Collins’ visit, knowing full well that numerous, affluent British anti-slavery adherents renounced their endorsement of AASS. MASS committee member Maria W. Chapman blamed Birney, Stanton and Scoble for discrediting AASS. The Motts and James M. McKim were particularly concerned that Collins would be “discountenanced by the great body of British Abolitionists” with little hope for actually obtaining any pecuniary aid. In Dublin, the AFASS men refrained from denouncing AASS, mainly due to Richard Webb and the Hibernian Anti-Slavery Society’s backing of the Garrisonians. On the other hand, Scoble perturbed HASS members by conspicuously imparting his “unsleeping hostility...malignity against the old organizationists in general & Garrison in particular.”⁴⁴⁴ Birney, Scoble and Stanton’s propaganda against the AASS, however, gained considerable headway amongst conservative British abolitionists. Collins, who later traveled with Remond, encountered open animosity at several English locals. Newspaper accounts suggested Birney and Stanton were behind much of the negative publicity; and a meeting with Clarkson verified, “the only opposition they received had grown out of the committal of the friends in this country with the advocates of “new organization.”⁴⁴⁵

Collins initially approached the EES, which garnered mixed results. In his version of events, some members of the Edinburgh society had chided Charles Stuart, long-time associate of Tappan, for introducing the dispute to Britain. Stuart’s circular focused on the

⁴⁴³ AASS, *An appeal to the abolitionists of Great Britain for the American Anti-Slavery Society*, September 25, 1840 (New York, 1840), John A. Collins, *Right and Wrong amongst the abolitionists of the United States* (Glasgow, 1841), 2nd edition, GES, *Resolutions*, p. 16, Thompson to Webb (2 November 1840), in Taylor, *BAA*, p. 118, William Bassett to E. Pease (23 September 1840), in Taylor, *BAA*, p. 115. Bassett and Pease collaborated on a piece entitled *The Society of Friends in the United States: their Views on the Slavery Question, and treatment of people of colour* (Darlington, 1840) that drew from Bassett’s own experiences and later expulsion from the Society of Friends for his anti-slavery beliefs.

⁴⁴⁴ Charles C. Burleigh to Chapman (unknown date), Garrison to E. Pease (30 September 1840), Chapman to E. Pease (30 September 1840), Webb to E. Pease (4 November 1840), in Taylor, *BAA*, pp. 117-20

⁴⁴⁵ Collins to Chapman (3 December 1840), in Taylor, *BAA*, pp. 126-131, Collins, *Right and Wrong*, pp. 8, 39-40, *Ipswich Journal*, “American Slavery” (2 January 1841). Clarkson’s words were quoted by Remond at an anti-slavery meeting in Ipswich.

“American—or woman-intruding—Anti-Slavery Society” but his in-person attacks denounced Garrison as an apostate. Persevering, Collins debated with Stuart at a special meeting of the EES committee and found, to his surprise, that a change in his favour had occurred, for several members of the society later welcomed him socially. Collins claimed Stuart, the “ignorant tool of Joseph Sturge,” was traveling around the UK drumming up support for AFASS and BFASS.⁴⁴⁶ Stuart’s condemnation of Garrison coincided with the arrival of Rev. Colver’s scurrilous letters to the BFASS committee, charging Garrison with heading an agnostic convention where the Sabbath, ministry and churches were questioned—“infidel fanaticism.” As for Collins, his mission was “suspicious...he is not entitled to your confidence.” Both Stuart and Colver’s letters were covertly copied and distributed by BFASS to various anti-slavery men and media throughout Britain, including Dr. Wardlaw.⁴⁴⁷

Wardlaw, already predisposed against AASS due to Garrison’s radical views on women’s rights, consequently found himself at odds with the more moderate or radical elements of GES, namely Murray and Smeal. The Doctor firmly supported BFASS’s exclusion of females at the World’s Convention and opposed the *Sixth Annual Report*, which gave the impression that GES condemned the London committee’s actions on the matter. In his opinion, this action was “an outrage upon all decorum, and an insult to that invaluable portion of the community, whose rights it professedly maintains.”⁴⁴⁸ The issue was not that simple, though. One must question why Wardlaw would suddenly distance himself from Garrison, someone he publicly heralded just weeks after the American boycotted the London Convention over the “Woman Question.” In his letter, Wardlaw refers to intelligence from an English friend that persuaded him to relinquish his role in GES. This friend, whom Wardlaw referred to an eminent person, was most likely his fellow Congregationalist, John Angell James. During that same period, James criticized

⁴⁴⁶ Collins to Chapman (3 December 1840), pp. 126-131, Collins to Garrison (27 December 1840), in Taylor, *BAA*, pp. 133-136, Collins, *Right and Wrong*, pp. 75-76, Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, p. 37. EES remained divided on the Garrison question, yet, loyal to BFASS. Dr. John Ritchie, who later joined GES’s public support for AASS and Garrison, was most likely one of Stuart’s detractors.

⁴⁴⁷ BFASS to Collins (2 January 1841), Collins to Henry G. Chapman (2 January 1841), in Taylor, *BAA*, pp. 137-139, Collins, *Right and Wrong*, pp. 75-75, GES, *Mr. J. A. Collins & the Emancipation Committee* (Glasgow, 1841), -----, *Resolutions*, pp. 11-12, -----, *Seventh Annual Report*, pp. 11-16, GFASS, *An Appeal to the Ladies of Great Britain* (Glasgow, 1841), pp. 7-9, *GA*, “American Slavery” (8 April 1841) and “J. A. Collins letter to the Editor” (26 April 1841), MASS, *Tenth Annual Report* (Boston, 1842), pp. 42-47, 50-51, Appendix, 33-35, -----, *Resolutions of the Ninth Annual Meeting* (Boston, 1841), *Morning Post*, “United States” (15 January 1841), Remond to Richard Allen (7 January 1841), Remond to Garrison (7 March 1841), in Ripley, *Black Abolitionist Papers*, I, pp. 85-95

⁴⁴⁸ Turley, *English antislavery*, pp. 218-219, Wardlaw to Murray and Smeal (19 February 1841), in *Resolutions*, pp. 12-13

Garrison's attachment to "extremist" issues; the Congregational Union of England likewise denounced American fanaticism for allegedly bringing disrepute to the anti-slavery cause—rhetoric Wardlaw used to justify his exit from GES.

Another reason was the charge of infidelity leveled at Garrison by Stuart and Colver, including various rumors concerning his views on the church, the ministry and the Sabbath. In the past, Wardlaw attacked the Unitarian faith, branding their theology as infidel due to its reliance on personal responsibility versus established creeds and confessions of faith. His *Discourses on the Principle Points of the Socianian Controversy* earned him wide notoriety within orthodox American Protestant circles, leading to numerous life-long friendships and prestigious appointments. Unorthodox religious beliefs did not sit well within Glaswegian Protestant circles either; Unitarians and other various "novel" sects were often stigmatized socially and Wardlaw, for one, did not hesitate to expel those from his own Congregationalist academy with heretical tendencies. In the past, Glasgow had earned a reputation for being sectarian, especially in matters concerning the Irish Roman Catholics; those who opposed the illiberal objectives of the orthodox Protestant clergy, more often than not, espoused civil and religious reforms, and were associated with the Glasgow Reform Association and Political Union. GES's Rev. William Anderson, in particular, conspicuously supported the Reformers.⁴⁴⁹

The *London Christian Pioneer*, a Unitarian journal edited by George Harris, also at odds with Wardlaw, was not surprised by Wardlaw's treatment of the James and Lucretia Mott, based on their divergent theological views (Hicksites). According to them, Glasgow, by far, was the worst in terms of bigotry and prejudice.⁴⁵⁰ In the 1840s, Wardlaw's church expelled several students for countenancing Morrisonianism. In general, Scottish orthodox evangelicals equated radicalism with infidelity and irreligion, demonstrating a much stricter form of Calvinism, which reacted harshly to new views.⁴⁵¹ This explains why Wardlaw disapproved of N. W. Taylor's New Haven Theology, considered heretical by orthodoxy American clergy. Church history claims Wardlaw was a moderate, but one contemporary source disputes this, alleging the Doctor held mainly orthodox views, explaining why, despite differing with the Establish Church on Voluntaryism, he was

⁴⁴⁹ CM, "Defeat of the Glasgow Bigots," (5 May 1832)

⁴⁵⁰ L. Mott, *Diary*, pp. 67, 80-81, J. And L. Mott, *Life and Letters*, pp. 171-176,

⁴⁵¹ Alexander, *Ralph Wardlaw*, pp. 150-155, 346-348, 423-426, Ralph Wardlaw, *Discourses on the Principle Points of the Socianian Controversy* (Andover, 1815), Carwardine, *Revivalism*, pp. 96-97

universally respected by their clerics and members, and often welcomed to their pulpits.⁴⁵²

GES ministers Heugh and King, who also protested against the *Sixth Annual Report*, belonged to the United Secession Church, which in early 1841 suspended several clergy for questioning central orthodoxies of USC. Those ousted from the Congregational Union of Scotland and USC later joined forces with others from Relief and Free Church of Scotland, establishing the Evangelical Union, a novel sect founded on the religious principles of C. G. Finney. During the 1830s, Heugh, King and Wardlaw were amongst the many Dissenters who supported sociopolitical reforms; however, by the 1840s, with the threat of Catholic revivalism—Catholic Emancipation, Irish immigration and the Oxford Movement—their outlook became more conservative, focusing on strengthening the transatlantic Protestant union and American connections were vital to this strategy. Former antagonists, Chalmers, King and Wardlaw, also joined forces to produce a series of essays on “Christian Union.” Likewise, the prioritizing of common evangelical doctrines reinforced the Evangelical Alliance but excluded many Protestant sects: Quakers, Plymouth Brethren, Unitarians and Universalists.⁴⁵³

By this period, all three doctors were eminent clergymen not only in Glasgow, but throughout Scotland and the British Isles. Heugh and Wardlaw attracted influential and exclusive congregations, representing Glasgow’s eminent and wealthy citizens; King operated within the same social circles—all three achieving considerable affluence and rank. Wardlaw alone amassed enough wealth to own a private carriage, seen in Victorian times as a sure sign of prosperity. Heugh retired early and travelled throughout Europe with his American clerical associates. King had long since inherited the large and influential Greyfriars Secession Church.⁴⁵⁴ Members of their respective congregations, mostly upper middle class and elites, certainly depreciated social connections to those deemed of dubious character, especially in religion, and potential members had to apply for admittance. Their adherence to societal norms (i.e. women’s sphere) would

⁴⁵² N. R. Needham, “Ralph Wardlaw,” in *SDCHT* (Edinburgh, 1993), p. 854, John Smith, *Our Scottish Clergy* (Edinburgh, 1848), pp. 57-66

⁴⁵³ Carwardine, *Revivalism*, pp. 96-101, Thomas Chalmers, *Essays on Christian Union* (London, 1845), J. F. Maclear, “The Evangelical Alliance and the Anti-Slavery Crusade,” *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 42:2 (Spring, 1979), pp. 141-164, -----, “American Protestantism and British Nonconformity,” p. 86, Ernest R. Sandeen, “The Distinctiveness of American Denominationalism,” *Church History*, 45:2 (1976), pp. 223-225

⁴⁵⁴ Andrew Aird, *Glimpses of old Glasgow* (Glasgow, 1894), pp. 306-311, *EC*, “Sketch of Rev. Dr. Heugh,” 20, New Series (December, 1846), pp. 697-713, *GM*, “Rev. Ralph Wardlaw, D.D.” (June, 1854), pp. 653-656, Donald C. Smith, ‘King, David (1806–1883)’, *ODNB* (Oxford, 2004) www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15556, John Smith, *Our Scottish Clergy* (Edinburgh, 1848), pp. 30-36, 57-66, *UPM*, “Memoirs of the Rev. Dr. Wardlaw,” 10 (March, 1856), pp. 119-123

automatically alienate the likes of Garrison and AASS. The upper middle class, affluent businessmen and orthodox clergymen of the AFASS were certainly more congenial to the likes of Heugh, King and Wardlaw. Another issue to consider was Heugh and Wardlaw's age—both represented two of the oldest ministerial members of GES (except for Dr. Kidston); born over a decade prior to Smeal and many other longtime subscribers of the society. Despite their fervor for reform in the 1830s, which allowed them access to voting privileges, both Heugh and Wardlaw remained fairly conservative in their sociopolitical views. Wardlaw, especially, came from a Tory-based household, voted Conservative himself and firmly adhered to social order theories, depreciating any attempt by the “lower orders” to expand their social and political rights.⁴⁵⁵

Wardlaw's closest US colleagues, in particular the Dr. Leonard Woods of Andover, were firmly orthodox and, likewise, repudiated innovative theology. More importantly, Woods, although sympathizing with slaves, was a rigid anti-abolitionist who detested the absolute principles of modern abolitionism, viewing them not only as “heretical fanatics” but detrimental to the survival of the American Church and Union. Similarly, Heugh maintained close relations with other American clerics, including Presbyterian Rev. Robert Baird, deemed pro-slavery for failing to admonish or exclude slaveholders. Baird, who considered Chalmers a close personal friend, believed the abolitionist motto *Fiat justitia ruat coleum*, often employed by GES, was impracticable and heathenish. Baird depreciated slavery, but more so despised the Garrisonians. Woods's negative opinion in relation to abolitionism was echoed throughout New York and New England by prominent clergymen, and approvingly copied by several leading US religious journals, which consistently endorsed his views.⁴⁵⁶

In 1836, a Congregationalist “Pastoral Letter” pressured American ministers, even those involved in anti-slavery, to withhold their services, meetinghouses and pulpits from abolitionists—a precedent that was followed by Presbyterian church bodies. A year later, another clerical manifesto, addressing “the appropriate sphere of women,” surfaced

⁴⁵⁵ Alexander, *Ralph Wardlaw*, Chapter 12, *RG*, “The Rev. Dr. Wardlaw, and the Honour of the Voluntaries,” (28 February 1835), pp. 283-284, *UPM*, “Ralph Wardlaw,” pp. 119-123, *GM*, “Rev. Ralph Wardlaw,” pp. 653-656

⁴⁵⁶ Goodell, *Slavery and Anti-slavery*, p. 409, *Literary and Theological Review*, “Slavery and Abolitionism,” eds. Charles D. Pigeon and Leonard Woods, VI (New York, 1839), pp. 41-59

⁴⁵⁶ Henry M. Baird, *The Life of the Rev. Robert Baird* (New York, 1866), pp. 206, 209-210, 248, Robert Baird, *The progress and prospects of Christianity in the United States of America* (London, 1851), pp. 51-67, 68-69, Hamilton M. Macgill, *Life of Hugh Heugh* (Edinburgh, 1852), pp. 415-416, Stanton to Birney (1 September 1837), in Birney, *Letters*, I, pp.420-424

opposing the Grimke sisters, who lectured to mixed-sex groups concerning immediate emancipation. Prior to this it was quite common for Quaker women to publicly preach in NE, including at some Congregationalist churches, without alarming ecclesiasts. The Grimkes' moral influence on the religious public, especially as untrained, unsanctioned theological commentators, threatened the authority of the church and its ministry.⁴⁵⁷ Clearly a counter-movement within New England orthodox clerical circles arose to undermine the credibility of abolitionists and paralyze their efforts. Anti-abolitionist clergy were overwhelmingly concerned about the influence of slavery on church unity; various divisions had already split the Presbyterian Church and would only lead to further national and regional divisions amongst other denominations. Due to the increasing pressure on conservative ministers sympathetic to anti-slavery, the Tappanites chose to secede from AASS over the "Woman Question," forming the more conservative AFASS, rather than risk losing their religious contingent. William Jay, an AFASS member, felt the US was intensely conservative and anti-slavery efforts needed to conform to accepted social conventions, otherwise they would alienate people to the cause. Although Jay left AASS, he remained on good terms with Garrison.⁴⁵⁸

Even non-ministerial commentators were publicly critical of abolitionists, labeling all those in favour of immediate emancipation as "ultras." Dr. David M. Reese, one of the more prolific writers, felt that censuring all slaveholders, under all circumstances, as sinful was an ultra, unscriptural dogma. He fiercely denounced AASS for their allegedly, "billingsgate language...vilification of all who differ from them—new gospel—our fathers—the churches—monomania—sincerity in error."⁴⁵⁹ Reese, however, did not condemn all anti-slavery as "ultras"—those who wished, prayed for the removal of slavery by gradual and prudent methods; yet, understood that, in his opinion, some aspects of slaveholding was not a sin against God and, in some respects, was authorized by Divine Law.⁴⁶⁰ In the past American and British anti-slavery circles also encountered similar opposition from conservatives and were often branded as fanatics, Jacobins, or ultras. James Stephen wrote in 1825,

Is it fanaticism, to regard a bondage imposed by acknowledged crime, as one that cannot be rightfully protracted, and fastened on the progeny for ever? Let

⁴⁵⁷ Budney, *William Jay*, p. 56 (fn. 3), Goodell, *Slavery and Anti-slavery*, pp. 425-433

⁴⁵⁸ Budney, *William Jay*, pp. 56-59, 61-64

⁴⁵⁹ David M. Reese, *Humbugs of New York* (New York, 1838), p. 143

⁴⁶⁰ Reese, *Humbugs*, pp. 144-147, 161. Reese did not condone Southern pro-slavery ministers, who used Biblical references to uphold the system of slavery but was also concerned about the disunion of the American church.

religion and wrong, religion and cruelty, religion and murder, shake hands.⁴⁶¹

Heugh and Wardlaw both owed their prestigious Divinity doctorates to their American church affiliations. The latter also occupied an eminent position on the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, along with Chalmers; a body that refused to publicly condemn slaveholders.⁴⁶² Heugh and Wardlaw oversaw various US church remonstrances drafted by USC and CUS, respectively, on the issue of slavery; however, neither body threatened to withhold fellowship, instead emphasizing their fraternal connections.⁴⁶³ Despite the focus on church involvement in slavery at 1840 London convention, including the testimony of American delegates, several ministerial members of GES still seemed surprised at the extent of Christian involvement and, likewise, were reluctant to sever fellowship with their American brethren.⁴⁶⁴ Collins represented AASS, who, under the influence of Garrison, militantly promoted a no-fellowship rule that expected God-fearing Christians to excommunicate all those implicated in slavery. Heugh and Wardlaw rejected Garrison's extreme stance as "ultra-dogmatism" and refused to identify themselves with AASS, placing GES in a precarious position concerning Collins' mission.⁴⁶⁵

On 11 February 1841 Collins attended an introductory meeting with GES, chaired by Dr. King, to speak on behalf of AASS and answer questions concerning anti-slavery divisions in the United States. Heugh, who did not attend the meeting, objected to GES supporting "that section of the American abolitionists, who support what is called the 'Woman Question.'" ⁴⁶⁶ In a letter to GES's Vice-Presidents, the secretaries exposed Wardlaw for colluding with Stuart by passing on the Captain's calumnious letter against AASS and Collins. Murray and Smeal demanded a full and open investigation into the matter, believing the debate over the admission of females had little to do with the true causes

⁴⁶¹ *British Colonial Slavery*, pp. 48-52, James Stephen, *England Enslaved* (London, 1826), pp. 88-91, WLG, *African colonization*, pp. 72-73, Goodell, *Slavery and Anti-slavery*, pp. 129-130, *QR*, "State of the Slave Trade," 34:305 (June-September, 1826), pp. 579-608. Both Dr. Andrew Thomson and Henry P. Brougham were accused of fanaticism.

⁴⁶² ABCFM, *Report of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions* (Boston, 1846), pp. 3-6, 8, Alexander, *Ralph Wardlaw*, p. 193, *Journal of Sacred Literature*, "Life of Hugh Heugh," VI (London, 1851), p. 419

⁴⁶³ *SLA*, "Resolutions of Several Bodies on the Subject of American Slavery" (1 July 1836), pp. 20-21, United Associate Synod of the Secession Church, *An Address on negro slavery to the Christian Churches in the United States of America* (Edinburgh, 1836)

⁴⁶⁴ *GESMB*, pp. 180-181 (20 October 1840)—Public meeting "Slavery in America, and results of Emancipation."

⁴⁶⁵ Macgill, *Hugh Heugh*, pp. 355, 505-507. Macgill recorded the sentiments of both Heugh and Wardlaw against the "ultraism" of certain American abolitionist leaders (i.e. Garrison).

⁴⁶⁶ GES, *Mr. J. A. Collins*, Heugh to GES committee (11 February 1841), in -----, *Resolutions*, p. 10, 29-30. Heugh decided he would withhold his annual GES subscription in protest.

behind the controversy. Wardlaw quickly resigned from the committee citing women's rights as his main objection, which the secretaries dismissed as a front for ulterior motives, including sectarian differences.⁴⁶⁷ By 10 March, the committee re-assembled to discuss a pamphlet issued by Murray and Smeal that recommended Collins' *Right and Wrong*, which discussed AASS's split, prefaced by a letter from Miss Harriet Martineau. Heugh and King disliked the appearance of GES siding with AASS, "the 'Women's Rights' party." Heugh wanted a formal announcement by GES declaring the society's stance as, in his opinion, against the women's rights issue. Murray, however, countered with a proposition of neutrality—neither advocating nor censuring the "Women's Rights question" in relation to the American abolitionist divisions, yet, still acknowledging GES's commitment to the Old society. Heugh's motion was defeated 4-6 in favour of Murray, prompting the Doctor to immediately resign his post, quitting all connection with the society.⁴⁶⁸

Bingham was right to suggest that Murray's proposal sought the endorsement of AASS, not female rights—a proposition several committee members disagreed with.⁴⁶⁹ The GES secretaries wished to avoid the "Woman Question" altogether, feeling it was just another,

One of the bugbears got up to serve a purpose, in the same way as the cry of "No Human Government" has been...failed to excite such opposition as to put sown the Original Anti-Slavery Society, or the overthrow the uncompromising Garrison and his faithful coadjutors, other charges have been devise—such as "Infidel", "Unitarian", "Denier of the Divine Authority of Scripture."⁴⁷⁰

Heugh's aversion to any pro-Garrison stance was mirrored by BFASS's Joseph Sturge, who also tendered his resignation as an Honourary member. With Collins' main detractors gone, GES swiftly moved to acknowledge AASS's agent and prepare a formal letter supporting the Old society's funding mission. Some GES members dissented from the proposals but were clearly outnumbered by Murray, Smeal and their adherents—bookseller George Gallie, in particular, was responsible for publishing Collins' controversial pamphlet. GES's *Circular to the Abolitionists of the United Kingdom* reiterated the society's commitment to AASS and urged other anti-slavery associations to "not entertain"

⁴⁶⁷ GES, *Seventh Annual Report*, pp. 10-16, -----. *Report of Discussion*, pp. 12-17, -----. *Resolutions*, pp. 11-19, Wardlaw to Murray and Smeal (19 February 1841)

⁴⁶⁸ *GESMB*, pp. 185-186 (10 March 1841), pp. 187-188 (16 March 1841)

⁴⁶⁹ Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, pp. 147-149

⁴⁷⁰ Murray and Smeal to Heugh (3 March 1841), in GES, *Resolutions*, pp. 21-23. The secretaries claimed they did not support women's rights, per se, but wished that the female delegates had been allowed admission into the 1840 Antislavery Convention.

other divisive issues, instead focus their efforts against American slavery.

Many have made the existing differences an excuse for not contributing in behalf of the great and praiseworthy object of the Society; and this again has tended to paralyze the efforts of many who formerly appeared its firm friends.⁴⁷¹

The original Glasgow Emancipation Society was built upon the principal of inclusion. The liberal attitude of the committee, dedicated to civil and religious reform, advocated an open policy to all abolitionists. The only requirement, despite the subscription fee, was that they support immediate and universal emancipation. Murray, Smeal and the other members adhered to the AASS not out of blind loyalty to Garrison, but out of respect for its abolitionists. It also reaffirmed their own rights, as individuals, to entertain differing social, religious and political views outwith GES, without it being held as an impediment to membership.

In an attempt to regain control of the society, Rev. Heugh organized a contingent of members against Murray and Smeal. During that meeting, those loyal to Heugh and Wardlaw carried a motion disclaiming the woman question; adopting a position of neutrality in relation to the diverging American societies—effectually excluding Collins—while abstaining from any endorsement of publications from either AASS or AFASS. The Glaswegian antislavery public, though, sympathized with Collins. The committee received a remonstrance from fifty-nine members and friends of the society; a request from the “Female abolitionists” of Glasgow for Collins and Thompson to lecture on the subject; and, finally, a memorial from over three hundred GES subscribers demanding AASS’s agent be allowed a public hearing. The *Glasgow Argus* printed a full-page testimonial from Garrison refuting the charges made against himself and AASS. *GA* editor, William Weir, criticized those who discredited Garrison over his alleged religious views; like many other Glaswegian reformers, he felt abolition was purely philanthropic, dealing with the moral and judicial dictates of freedom and the rights of man.⁴⁷²

Tait’s praised Garrison and other AASS members, as, “tried and distinguished soldiers of the cause,” while advertising Collins’ *Right and Wrong*. *Tait’s* was the only British

⁴⁷¹ Collins, *Right and Wrong*, GES, “Circular to the Abolitionists of the United Kingdom,” in *GESMB*, pp. 192-195 (29 March 1841), *GESMB*, pp. 188-191 (25 March 1841), pp. 191-195 (29 March 1841), Sturge to Smeal (25 January 1841), Gallie also published GES’s *Resolutions*, p. 5.

⁴⁷² *GA*, “American Slavery” (8 April 1841), GES, *Resolutions*, pp. 39-41, *GESMB*, pp. 196-198 (13 April 1841), Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, p. 110

journal at that time edited by a female, Christian Isobel Johnstone. In its January 1841 edition, it printed a satire entitled “Man and his Missus!” chiding abolitionists for their conservative attitude towards female participation in anti-slavery efforts. Collins confidently noted that, although GES’s committee was in a hubbub, the society had held several meetings on the subject and the local media and public, including the Unitarian church, backed him.⁴⁷³

In a public meeting held at Rev. Nisbett’s Church, Albion Street, on 16 April 1841, the committee resolved to publicize all correspondence involved in the recent GES disputes, which, most likely, mortified Heugh and Wardlaw. The Glasgow society wanted transparency on the issue, to expose what the majority felt was an underhanded maligning of the old society by AFASS and BFASS partisans. Even Gallie, who removed himself from the general committee, believed the debate should be aired and published GES’s *Resolutions* on the controversy. Rev. King, though, tried to paint Collins as a subversive, claiming,

The Committee had been charged with very terrible crimes...men on whose brow the brand of pro-slavery had been fixed. Who is this that comes from America to tell us of the character of our fellow-townsmen? When did Dr. Wardlaw, when did Dr. Heugh, when did Mr. Anderson of John Street, when did Mr. Harvey become midway abolitionists?⁴⁷⁴

Collins countered with a public letter published by *GA*, denying he had maligned any of the ministers involved. He did, though, feel King, like BFASS, used his social influence to obtain anti-AASS resolutions.⁴⁷⁵

Soon thereafter, Murray, Smeal and other progressive members of GES collaborated with moral force Chartists to insure a victorious and very public denunciation of the old GES executive committee. The secretaries felt that Heugh, King and Wardlaw, by discrediting the AASS and Collins, had violated the very basic catholic principles of the society—acceptance of all who advocated emancipation of slaves—class, political, religious, or social tendencies were irrelevant. Despite their eminent rank and status, these men should be accountable to their constituents, “in the very same way as a Parliamentary constituency

⁴⁷³ Collins to unknown recipient (3 April 1841), in Taylor, *BAA*, pp. 142-143, *Tait’s*, “Review of Mr. Combe’s Notes on the United States” (April, 1841), p. 242, “Pamphlets” (May, 1841), p. 334. Henry and Maria Child.

⁴⁷⁴ GES, *J. A. Collins*, pp. 1-2, *GESMB*, p. 198 (16 April 1841)

⁴⁷⁵ Collins to *GA*, “Letter to the Editor” (24 April 1841), GES, *J. A. Collins*, pp. 1-2

does its representatives in the House of Commons.”⁴⁷⁶

The public meeting, held at the Glasgow Bazaar, attracted approximately four thousand people. Rev. Patrick Brewster, a moral force Chartist, chaired the event and was joined by fellow Chartist supporter and prominent Edinburgh clergyman, Dr. John Ritchie. Smeal was relentless, condemning the prejudicial actions of the executive committee in relation to Collins; refusing to compromise his anti-slavery principles, nor go against AASS and Garrison, declaring, “Hail thy slanderers as they will!—Lloyd Garrison, I’ll love thee still.”⁴⁷⁷ Bingham and Rice, though, portrayed the Chartist involvement with GES as the “price” Murray and Smeal paid to retain control over the society.⁴⁷⁸ Certainly the secretaries utilized Chartist support to overwhelmingly defeat the conservative GES bloc, ushering in pro-Garrison committee personnel and resolutions; yet, the Glasgow society long held significant ties to those involved in the movement.

Rev. Brewster, who conspicuously advocated for the working class and poor, even at GES meetings, subscribed to the Glasgow society since 1836 and by 1837 was an Honorary member. Dr. Ritchie served on Edinburgh antislavery societies since 1830, which, over the years, mutually cooperated with GES. More importantly, though, of the seventeen committeemen added, several had subscriptions to the society since 1835 and, despite paying their 5 s. (the requirement for membership), were not acknowledged on the official committee lists. The more well known of the group, James Turner of Thrushgrove, and his colleague and relative, William Lang, supported universal rights and were sympathetic to moral force Chartism. Turner and Lang financially backed GES since its inception. Other long-term adherents included: Peter Bruce (since 1835), William Lohead (since 1836), and Ronald Wright (through wife, GLASS, since 1836), all active local reformers. Andrew Paton, another addition, was a Glaswegian merchant and staunch Liberal, who participated in numerous public movements and associations throughout the city. According to political reformer John McAdam, A. Paton, along with Murray, Smeal and newcomer John Ure, also endorsed Chartism.⁴⁷⁹

⁴⁷⁶ GES, *Resolutions*, pp. 3, 42. Signed by Murray and Smeal, 15 May 1841.

⁴⁷⁷ GA, “Glasgow Emancipation Society Meeting April 1841” (29 April 1841)

⁴⁷⁸ Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, pp. 150-152, 274, Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, pp. 110-11, 213

⁴⁷⁹ GES, *First Annual Report*, p. 47, -----. *Second Annual Report*, pp. 38-39, -----. *Third Annual Report*, pp. 8, 140-142, -----. *Fourth Annual Report*, pp. 6, 70-71, -----. *Fifth Annual Report*, pp. 5, 34-38, -----. *Sixth Annual Report*, pp. 7, 51-53, -----. *Seventh Annual Report*, pp. 107-109, -----. *Resolutions*, pp. 4-5, *GESMB*, pp. 199-201 (27 April 1841), GH, “The Late Andrew Paton,” (18

Due to the original make-up of the society (i.e. certain conservatives), many of the subscribers were either too radical or not socially prominent enough for official committee posts, although they consistently donated funds to GES and were official members. The incorporation of such men, with well-known Chartist and radical leanings, offended the more conservative members who were, most likely, concerned about GES's public image, especially any links to Chartism, considered a socially disruptive movement led by the "lower orders." Several meetings were held in May 1841, in which several colleagues of Heugh, King and Wardlaw disputed the new additions—Wardlaw himself appearing during one such occasion. The advocates of Murray and Smeal, however, were men known for their middle class radical leanings, including those who consistently sought class cooperation in reform. Despite the recent lull in relations between middle and working class reformers, several GES committeemen still championed the rights of the lower classes, in particular, complete suffrage.⁴⁸⁰

The big showdown occurred on 31 May in the Trades' Hall, Glasgow—only those who had contributed 5 s. or more for the past three years were invited. This was an obvious ploy by the opposition to diminish the influence of Murray and Smeal, which backfired, considering many of the new committeemen had already subscribed to GES for several years. The "Battle Royal," as Webb called it, commenced between two very distinct GES parties—one group, those more conservative and/or loyal to Heugh, King and Wardlaw; versus the second group, those who supported Murray and Smeal, not necessarily due to converging sociopolitical views but in support of the defamed AASS and Garrison. Mr. Allan Clark was chosen to officiate the proceedings, "as a gentleman who was in no way connected with the disputes on either side."⁴⁸¹

Heugh's argument maintained that the American "Woman Question" had invaded the London convention, later dividing GES. He accused Murray and Smeal of orchestrating the *Sixth Annual Report* in favour of the women delegates, which his colleagues disapproved of. Heugh, however, also denigrated the opinions of "certain people" (Chartists) present at the last GES meeting. King decried the criticisms leveled at the old

August 1884), McAdam, *Autobiography*, pp. 16-17, 227-228, Henry C. Wright, *Human Life* (Boston, 1849), pp. 13-17, 69-77

⁴⁸⁰ *Northern Star and Leeds General Advertiser*, "Great, Glorious, and Triumphant Victory of O'Connor and the Chartists of Glasgow," (November 13, 1841), *GA*, "Henry Vincent Lecture," (29 September 1842), *RG*, "Henry Vincent and Complete Suffrage," (8 October 1842), Montgomery, *Glasgow Radicalism*, pp. 215-217

⁴⁸¹ GES, *Report of Discussion*, pp. 3-4, *GESMB*, pp. 201-203 (19 May 1841), pp. 203-204 (24 May 1841), pp. 205-206 (31 May 1841), Webb to Garrison (30 May 1841), in Taylor, *BAA*, p. 152

GES committee, especially the ministers, stating, “Was it not said that the clergymen of America were the bulwarks of slavery...that the clergy of this city were no better?”⁴⁸² He criticized the secretaries for allying with the Chartists to condemn the executive committee, in return for upholding the Charter, identifying GES publicly with the movement. Paton confirmed that both Heugh and Wardlaw refused to rescind their resignations, unless the woman question was disavowed by GES, while maintaining strict neutrality in reference to the American parties. Unlike Heugh and King, though, Paton was willing to lower the membership entry from 5 s. to enable poorer persons to join, however, he insisted a financial “test” should still hold for qualification into the society—this, of course, would still exclude most working-class Chartists, who could not afford the subscription.⁴⁸³

Leading the opposing party, Smeal quickly asserted that the “Woman Question” was a ruse, citing past motions by Heugh and King praising both male and female American abolitionist actions. He claimed that certain Glasgow committeemen “at the present hour” trivialized slavery in America and, in particular, its connection with US Churches, which increasingly censured abolitionists. Smeal further denied that GES was based upon Chartist principles, but ascertained that was the main objection of certain committee members to the new additions; yet, surprisingly, those same detractors were themselves unqualified for membership for nonpayment of fees. Wright challenged Heugh’s assertion that GES’s dispute was based solely on the woman issue. In his opinion, Collins had not come to advocate for female rights, the old committee had merely used that excuse to avoid officially receiving the AASS agent, “Had he thought that Mr. Collins came here to argue the woman's question, he would have been the last person to take him up.”⁴⁸⁴

Lastly, E. Anderson repeated the sentiments of the opposition group declaring the woman Question had nothing to do with GES, along with judgments on the Sabbath question and marriage question. He regretted being apposed to such “venerable and excellent men in the Committee [but]...it was measures, not men—principles, not individuals, they were to look to.”⁴⁸⁵ In the end it was King who suggested the groups should separate into two distinct societies, doubting the original GES was capable of continuing as a united association. Rev. Harvey, who had long assisted the working class, did not object to the

⁴⁸² GES, *Report of Discussion*, pp. 4-11, 23

⁴⁸³ GES, *Report of Discussion*, pp. 7-12, 23

⁴⁸⁴ GES, *Report of Discussion*, pp. 12-25

⁴⁸⁵ GES, *Report of Discussion*, pp. 22-23

inclusion of new members and moved to accept the additions, which was carried by a majority.⁴⁸⁶ What followed was a long-winded list of resignations, mainly from the ministerial members of GES but also from lay members. Between June-August 1841, the Glasgow Emancipation Society recorded a further ten resignations, although others eventually removed themselves from their official capacity. It is interesting to note that Rev. Harvey, along with Rev. Anderson, although objecting to direct female participation in male anti-slavery societies, as well as women's rights, remained as GES committee members along with several other clergymen. Dr. Watson, who also supported Heugh and King in reference to the woman issue, also continued to actively participate in GES.⁴⁸⁷

This certainly does question the validity of the "Women Question" as the central dividing factor within the society. Most likely, the combination of a conservative backlash to Garrison's more radical ideals; AASS's espousal of mixed-sex societies; along with the increasing focus on American Church involvement in slavery; made continued participation in GES problematic for certain, especially religious, committeemen. This same year, though, the Liberal Party of Glasgow suffered schisms over the patronage debate in the Church of Scotland. Some long-term Voluntary reformers—clergy and laymen—refused side with the evangelical CoS party, while others felt it was a matter of religious principle.⁴⁸⁸ The controversy, undoubtedly, affected other reformist endeavors, not just anti-slavery.

Nonetheless, the main instigators, Heugh and Wardlaw, could not publicly support any pro-Garrison abolitionist society, which conflicted with their upper-class social and religious norms (women's sphere, Christian fellowship, and orthodox views), and condemned by their American brethren. Their partiality to AFASS—men of wealth, status, and religiously conservative—a more socially acceptable anti-slavery association, complimented their societal and ecclesiastical expectations. Others, like W. Paton, were displeased with Murray and Smeal's handling of the crisis, perhaps by their public denunciation of Heugh, King and Wardlaw, and choose to leave GES more from a sense of loyalty and propriety than anything else. The final group that resigned, however, appear to have left due to the inclusion of Chartist and radical supporters; any endorsement for

⁴⁸⁶ GES, *Report of Discussion*, p. 26, Montgomery, *Glasgow Radicalism*, pp. 184, 198-199

⁴⁸⁷ BFASS, *Proceedings*, pp. 37-38, Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, p. 153, *GESMB*, pp. 206-212 (16 June to 2 August 1841), GES, *Report of Discussion*, p. 4-5, -----, *Seventh Annual Report*, pp. 28-29

⁴⁸⁸ Henry P. Brougham to William Brougham (29 December 1840), *Brougham Papers*, UCL, *Belfast Newsletter*, "The Conduct of the Voluntaries in Relation to the Patronage Question," (6 April 1841), "The Voluntaries and the Church of Scotland," (13 April 1841)

Chartism, considered the most radical political position in Victorian times, alienated most middle-class benevolent societies.⁴⁸⁹

The split amongst quarrelling factions in GES certainly had long-range effects. The more conservative element of the Glasgow Ladies Auxiliary withdrew their financial support, an important source of revenue for the male association. The Glasgow society also lost several influential and prominent ministers, diminishing its prestige and strength within the community. The divisions also impeded the British anti-slavery movement. GES sided with the AASS, upholding Garrison's absolutist views on slavery; but, along with Dublin and some abolitionists in Edinburgh, refused to recognize the leadership of BFASS. Although this handicapped the national cause, which did not regain its unification until after the Civil War, the Glasgow abolitionists continued to work with local and national societies to achieve slavery-related aims, both in American and throughout the world.

Locally, though, the original Glaswegian society recovered from the ordeal and remained a force to be reckoned with. The seceders, however, would not regroup until 1851-52 when Harriet Beecher Stowe arrived in the UK to promote *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Under the leadership of Murray and Smeal, GES became increasingly militant in its abolitionist methods, mirroring the efforts of Garrison and AASS, as well as demonstrating its more radical reformist leanings. By the early 1840s, GES's grass-roots campaign against the Evangelical Alliance and the Free Church of Scotland would humble and, ultimately, divide evangelicals on the issue of Christian fellowship with slaveholders; and, once again, brought the society into conflict with orthodox Scottish clergy.

⁴⁸⁹ Fladeland, "Our Cause being One and the Same," pp. 69-99, GES, *Report of Discussion*, pp. 11-12

Church and State Disunion—“No Union with Slaveholders, nor fellowship with pro-slavery ministers or churches”⁴⁹⁰

Chapter V

If there is a man here who feels for a moment that I should not unmask the Free Church of Scotland, he has more love for his sect than for truth, more love for his religious denomination than for God.

Frederick Douglass⁴⁹¹

Following the break-up of the society in mid-1841, GES actively pursued various anti-slavery related issues—African social and commercial development; Amistad liberation; British Indian slavery; “Hill Coolie” emigration; and free trade; yet, as always, they revisited the contentious issue of American Church involvement in slavery.⁴⁹² Since its inception, the Glasgow society pursued a hardline policy against the system of slavery as inconsistent with the spirit and precepts of Christianity, expecting all ministers of the Gospel to remonstrate faithfully with their stateside brethren on the subject. Back then Dr. Andrew Thomson hinted at dechristianizing slaveholders, yet, believed some remained ignorant of their misdoings, influenced by cultural prejudice. He did not, however, condone the continuance of slavery for religious or secular means.

To say that we will come out of the sin by degrees...the path of duty is plain before us; and we have nothing to do but to enter it at once, and to walk in it without turning to the right hand or to the left. Our concern is not with the result that may follow our obedience to the divine will. Our great and primary concern is to obey that will. God reigns over his universe in the exercise of infinite perfection: he commands us to let the oppressed go free, and to break every yoke.⁴⁹³

Garrison looked to this idea of Christian perfectionism when analysing the church’s responsibility in reference to US slavery, which coincided with 1830s revivalist theories of free will. Revivalists, such as C. G. Finney, placed great weight upon personal free will, allowing the individual to affect their own salvation and, in consequence, help remove other worldly sins. Traditional Calvinist doctrine, however, believed man, by nature, was

⁴⁹⁰ GA, “No Union with Slaveholders, nor fellowship with pro-slavery ministers or churches” (November 21, 1844). GES’s meeting at City Hall on 18 October 1844.

⁴⁹¹ Frederick Douglass, *The Free Church of Scotland and American Slavery* reprinted in DC (3 February 1846)

⁴⁹² Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, pp. 163-170, *GESMB*, pp. 212-242 (2 August 1841 to 17 February 1844), Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, pp. 115-116

⁴⁹³ WLG, *African colonization*, pp. 87, Thomson, *Slavery not sanctioned*, p. 22

sinful and unable to change his destiny. Orthodox, especially Calvinist clerics, rejected human “perfectionism” and the idea of free will. Garrison had already showed perfectionist leanings in his *Thoughts on African colonization*, especially in relation to Dr. Thomson’s immediate speech. Ultras believed the world’s ills could be solved through simple reform, achieved immediately. Contemporaries usually referred to any quasi-religious innovation as ultraism. Immediate emancipation, temperance, peace, etc. were all considered ultra activities. The doctrine of free will, with the rigid determinism of orthodox Calvinism disappearing, emphasized such perfectionism.⁴⁹⁴

The Glasgow society embraced Dr. Thomson and Garrison’s approach to dealing with the system of enslavement as one of moral absolutes; believing moral suasion would enlighten God-fearing Christians of their duty to desist from, as well as disclaim, the sin of slaveholding. Even Dr. Wardlaw, inspired by Thomson, joined in the call for instant liberation of the slaves, despite being a firm gradualist beforehand.⁴⁹⁵ George Thompson’s first visit to the US, uncovering ministerial complicity in relation to slavery, helped to solidify GES’s disapprobation. British clerical delegates, like Drs. F. A. Cox, Andrew Reed and James Matheson, were publicly chastised by GES for failing to condemn the system while visiting Southern churches. The Glasgow Society initiated, along with several GES ministerial members and their respective denominations, a remonstrance addressing the people of the United States. In their opinion, slavery was “utterly incompatible with the Christian profession. How deplorably corrupt, then, must American Christianity have become, which can sanction and uphold so iniquitous a system!”⁴⁹⁶

Yet, as the decade continued, it became apparent that the unified consensus of British Christians against slavery had done little to sway the feelings of their US brethren. In some respects, it further hardened the resolve of American religious bodies against abolition. In a letter to Thompson, Wendell Phillips implored British Christians to continue remonstrating against the American church; otherwise the cause would weaken: “Did they realise, that Slavery is most frequently defended now in America from the

⁴⁹⁴ James Bratt, “Religious Anti-Revivalism in Antebellum America,” pp. 71-72, Hammond, “Revival Religion,” pp. 175-186, Turley, *English antislavery*, pp. 218-219, Robert L. Kelly, *The transatlantic persuasion* (New York, 1969), pp. 308-310

⁴⁹⁵ Alexander, *Ralph Wardlaw*, Chapter 12, Macgill, *Hugh Heugh*, pp. 505-507, Wardlaw, *The Jubilee*, pp. 23-28, 30-32, 36-37. Wardlaw’s firmly believed in Providence and “national sin”—not free will, per se—to spare Britain from God’s judgment, the country had to relinquish slavery without delay. He did not adopt perfectionist or “ultraist” ideals.

⁴⁹⁶ GES, *Second Annual Report*, pp. 25-27, 31-37, -----, *Third Annual Report*, pp. 10, 14-18, 59-64, 100-109. Remonstrances from Congregational Union of Scotland, Relief Synod, and United Associate Synod followed.

Bible—that when Abolitionists rebuke the Church for upholding it, they are charged with hostility to Christianity itself.”⁴⁹⁷

Some commentators, however, saw the writing on the wall. British memorials sent to stateside religious bodies were often viewed contemptuously with US church bodies refusing to acknowledge slavery was wrong. One American minister, branding the church as the “pillar and ground” of slavery, complained that annual letters were routinely edited, removing any mention of the delicate subject of slavery.⁴⁹⁸ The Scottish USC, in particular, was aware that since 1833 its memorials to US church bodies on slavery were often disregarded, shelved by those antagonistic to the cause.⁴⁹⁹ Northern clergymen sympathetic to anti-slavery, such as Rev. Gardiner Spring of New York, counter-attacked abolitionists as fanatics for championing immediate emancipation at all costs and depreciated any suggestion of excommunicating Christians for their involvement in slavery. Spring’s *Slavery Discussed in occasional essays* was reprinted in 1846 by the Presbyterian Board and, again, in 1847 by William Collier of Glasgow. Rev. Bacon, a US Congregational minister, wrote extensively about the collision between AASS and the clergy. He noted several leading clerics—Lyman Beecher, Jeremiah Day, Noah Porter, Moses Stuart, and Leonard Woods—consciously stood aloof from AASS, as “grasshoppers” on the anti-slavery subject.⁵⁰⁰ Other churchmen, both North and South, choose to justify the system, eliciting the ire of some clerics—

Hell never enacted upon our miserable earth a species of wickedness too base to find clerical defenders and apologists. War, murder, inquisitions, drunkenness, despotism, and lastly, that sum of all villainies, slavery, have never wanted advocates among the clergy.⁵⁰¹

Birney’s tract *The American Churches the Bulwarks of American Slavery* certainly painted a grim picture. By 1840, the three major US denominations, Baptist, Methodist Episcopal and Presbyterian, had all taken steps to undermine abolitionist efforts; the Methodist national conference that year resolved slavery was instituted by God and sanctioned by the Bible. The Presbyterian Church, in particular, split into the New and Old School—the

⁴⁹⁷ Wendell Phillips to Thompson (29 July 1839), reprinted in GES, *Fifth Annual Report*, pp. 61-61

⁴⁹⁸ GES, *Fifth Annual Report*, pp. 69-71, SIA, “Thomas Swan to Thomas Price” (November, 1836), pp. 114-116

⁴⁹⁹ *United Secession Magazine*, “Monthly Retrospect” (January, 1845), p. 46

⁵⁰⁰ Leonard Bacon, *Slavery Discussed in occasional essays* (New York, 1846), pp. 138, 157-158, 234, 225-230, Gardiner Spring, *The Obligations of the World to the Bible* (New York, 1839), pp. 214-251

⁵⁰¹ Bacon, *Slavery Discussed*, p. 227. Quote from a colleague of Bacon’s.

former seemingly more anti-slavery, although inconsistent; the latter apologist. As one Presbyterian cleric put it, “If slavery be a sin...three-fourths of all the Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians, in eleven states of the Union are of the devil.”⁵⁰² To the surprise and concern of Lewis Tappan, even AFASS abolitionist ministers were increasingly defecting, for, as fellow-member Elizur Wright complained, “they loved the cause, but would not risk all for it.”⁵⁰³

The words of Garrison, “I want men to feel and act as *Christians*,”⁵⁰⁴ though, resonated with Murray, Smeal and the majority of GES members. The reassembled Glasgow committee still retained its zealous evangelical slant, advocating other quasi-religious endeavours, such as temperance and peace, in the same vein as Garrison and his supporters. Under the leadership of the secretaries, both of whom fiercely espoused such ideals, it is no wonder the society took great issue with reputedly evangelical bodies receiving into communion and apologizing for those involved in slavery. To them it was deplorable, bringing Christianity into disrepute, as well as a sin against God that demanded immediate cessation. Therefore, GES periodically held public meetings to address the contentious issue of Christianity and slavery, a practice that continued after the resignation of a large portion of clerical members.

The arrival of Henry C. Wright, an AASS affiliate, further galvanized their efforts. Wright, a radical anti-war social reformer, meddled right in with GES’s more progressive members, especially Murray, A. Paton and Smeal. By August 1843, the society began holding large public meetings to discuss American church complicity in slavery, while adopting the militant approach of “no fellowship” with Christians upholding the system.⁵⁰⁵ At the annual meeting, Dr. Michael Willis rejected scriptural pro-slavery arguments, commending GES for sustaining their efforts in the holy cause. Wright urged Scottish ministers, including Chalmers, to exclude all religious persons from the US connected with slavery; otherwise “they will be helping to sustain the monster of blood amongst us.”

⁵⁰² GA, “Christianity versus Slavery” (8 November 1841), Birney, *The American Churches the Bulwarks of American Slavery*, Stephen S. Foster, *The Brotherhood of Thieves* (Concord, 1843), pp. 14, 34-68. Comment by Rev. James Smylie, Mississippi, in defense of slavery.

⁵⁰³ L. Tappan to J. Sturge (14 December 1839) in Abel and Klingberg, *Sidelight*, pp. 64-67, *SIA*, “Elizur Wright to Thomas Price,” (November, 1836), pp. 114-116. Wright’s quote from letter dated 23 September 1836.

⁵⁰⁴ WLG, “Norfolk County (Massachusetts) Anti-Slavery Society Speech”, reprinted in GES, *Seventh Annual Report*, pp. 98-102

⁵⁰⁵ *GESMB*, “‘The American Churches the Bulwarks of American Slavery’ Public Meeting 17 August 1843,” pp. 238-239 (17 August 1843)

Local minister, J. Dickinson of Kilmarnock, agreed, admitting that British Christians had a duty to expostulate their American brethren—"if they repent not, disown them."⁵⁰⁶

The Free Church, blood money, and the quandary of Christian fellowship

That same year the Disruption occurred. The newly formed Free Church of Scotland, now independent of government funding, sought monetary aid from America, including donations from pro-slavery Southern churches. The Glasgow Emancipation Society swiftly condemned the move, calling on FCS to,

To acquit themselves as becomes Christians and Scotchmen, in regard to pecuniary contributions from American Slave holders; and in particular, the contributions sent them from Charleston, South Carolina; and not to accept such but to refuse and send them back to the donors, accompanied with a faithful and plain dealing testimony to the American Churches against Slavery.⁵⁰⁷

Following Glasgow's lead, Edinburgh published a letter from the AFASS urging the Free Church to reconsider its position, to which GES copied a further five hundred, audaciously distributed at FCS's General Assembly. Lewis Tappan wrote Scoble in April condemning FCS's actions as, a monstrous error that would paralyze the efforts of American Christian abolitionists. Clearly the acceptance of slaveholder money, as well as Dr. Chalmers defence of such, gave ample fodder to both Southern and Northern pro-slavery ministers.⁵⁰⁸ Back in the US, Garrison also widely covered the controversy in the *Liberator* and reported GES's resolutions opposing the FCS in full.⁵⁰⁹

GES immediately pressured the Free Church to return the donation, launching a large-scale propaganda campaign addressing all Scottish Presbyteries and Synods, their respective Moderators and influential ministers; supplying numerous copies of anti-FCS pamphlets to the *Glasgow Argus* and distributed amongst British, French and US anti-slavery circles.

⁵⁰⁶ GES, *Ninth Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1843), pp. 15-20, 30-40, *GESMB*, pp. 233-236 (1 August 1843), pp. 236-238 (2 August 1843)

⁵⁰⁷ *GESMB*, pp. 243-246 (14 March 1844), *GH*, "Glasgow Emancipation Society" (18 March 1844), *Scotsman*, "Meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society" (20 March 1844)

⁵⁰⁸ *GESMB*, pp. 257-258 (1 July 1844), EES, *Letter from the Executive Committee from the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society to the Commissioners of the Free Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1844), L. Tappan to Scoble (10 April 1844), Chalmers to Thomas Smyth (25 September 1844), L. Tappan to Sturge (15 November 1844), in Abel and Klingberg, *Sidelight*, pp. 181-182, 196-200

⁵⁰⁹ Garrison to the Glasgow Emancipation Society (1 June 1846), in WLG, *Letters*, III, pp. 682-684, Walter M. Merrill, *Against Wind and Tide: a biography of William Lloyd Garrison* (Harvard, 1963), p. 211

The Glasgow society was the first British association to initiate a public campaign opposing the Free Church's stance on American slavery. Once again, GES had pre-empted even the national BFASS, who reported Glaswegian abolitionist activities organised on the subject. GES's public meeting opposing the FCS was held on 14 March 1844. The AFASS letter, reprinted by EES, was not written until April. BFASS addressed the subject during mid-late 1844, only after the controversy became popular.⁵¹⁰ BFASS's opinion concurred with GES, including its scathing assessment of Chalmers supposed anti-slavery sentiment. The Doctor's letter to known slavery apologist, Rev. Dr. Thomas Smyth of South Carolina, was published widely in the US and in the *BFASR*, who, surprisingly, quoted one "fervid genius" American abolitionist (most likely Garrison), as saying, "let not English or Scotch doctors of divinity assail us, and tell Southern despots that we do not understand the religion of Christ."⁵¹¹ Locally the *Glasgow Herald* and other Scottish media covered GES's attack on the FCS, reprinting Chalmers letters in defence of slavery. Their transatlantic friends credited GES with exposing the slight. The Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society praising the Glasgow society for first exposing FCS.⁵¹²

Dr. Willis, a GES founding committeeman, was the connecting link. Formerly an Old Licht Burgher cleric, Willis transferred back to the established Scottish church in 1839, only to leave at the Disruption to become a Free Church minister. During the initial onslaught against the Free Church, Dr. Willis conspicuously denounced his fellow brethren—Dr. Cunninghame and Dr. Burns, deputed to America—but also FCS's acceptance of slaveholders' money. Willis supported several motions urging FCS to return the donations and proposed that GES should prepare a memorial, addressed to all churches, rejecting fellowship with slaveholders.⁵¹³ Another Free Church cleric, Rev. James Macbeth, joined Willis to form the Free Church Anti-Slavery Society. Both clerics continued to back GES's no fellowship agenda, viewing their parallel campaigns as cooperative, yet, hoped to alter FCS's official policy within the church's own courts,

⁵¹⁰ *AJ*, "American Slavery and the Free Church" (December 4, 1844), *BASR*, "Glasgow Emancipation Society—The Free Church" (21 August 1844) and "The Free Church of Scotland" (11 December 1844), GES, *Tenth Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1844), pp. 10-11, *GESMB*, pp. 243-246 (14 March 1844), MASS, *Thirteenth Annual Report* (Boston, 1845), pp. 18-22

⁵¹¹ *BASR*, "The Free Church of Scotland" (11 December 1844)

⁵¹² BoFASS, *Eleventh Annual Report* (Boston, 1844), pp. 30-36, *GH*, "Slavery in America" (30 December 1844)

⁵¹³ *BASR*, "To Christian Ministers and Churches of Every Denomination," 6:2 (22 January 1845), *GA*, "No Union with Slaveholders, nor fellowship with pro-slavery ministers or churches" (21 November 1844), *GESMB*, pp. 267-269 (18 August 1844), GES, *Tenth Annual Report*, p. 23, -----, *To Christian Ministers and Churches of Every Denomination* (Glasgow, 18 October 1844), *GH*, "Glasgow Emancipation Society" (18 March 1844), "Glasgow Emancipation Society" (4 August 1845), *Scotsman*, "American Slavery and the Free Church" (23 November 1844)

versus publicly. Rice suggests that Dr. Willis left GES in mid-1846, becoming the President of the FCASS, to avoid embarrassment. However, in a letter addressed to the Glasgow committee, both Macbeth and Willis, reaffirmed their commitment to the campaign, as well as their mutual partnership with GES, believing the issue touched upon fundamental principles of justice and humanity.⁵¹⁴

Another well-known Irish clergyman, though, painted a more sinister picture of the Free Church controversy. Isaac Nelson, a Belfast minister, accused FCS of utilising bully tactics to silence dissenting clerics within its ranks, including throughout the wider Presbyterian community. Clergymen were threatened with ministerial discipline and public slander for speaking against the Free Church in relation to Southern slavery.⁵¹⁵ Despite this, Willis accepted the office of Vice-President in the Glasgow society and continued to staunchly oppose communion with pro-slavery churches, both within FCS and in published works. He officially remained with GES until 1851-52, at which time he immigrated to Canada, joining former member Dr. Burns (FCS), a GES Honorary and Corresponding member, who also disapproved of his church's reception of slaveholding money.⁵¹⁶ The fate of Rev. Macbeth, who almost ruined his career over the issue, is more familiar. Macbeth joined GES in 1844 and wrote two highly publicised tracts condemning Christian fellowship with slaveholders that dismantled the apologist and pro-fellowship arguments of FCS's leaders Drs. Candlish and Cunningham. Within a few years, Cunningham accused Macbeth of sexual impropriety. Although not proven, the accusation damaged Macbeth's reputation and he also relocated to Canada.⁵¹⁷ Of course, the FCS did not limit themselves to persecuting anti-slavery ministers, they were known to obliterate any dissenting clergy in their ranks, even those who expressed Voluntary sentiments.⁵¹⁸

⁵¹⁴ GH, "Glasgow Female Anti-Slavery Society" (4 August 1845), *Evangelical Repository*, "The Free Church of Scotland, and the Question of American Slavery" (August, 1846), pp. 199-201, *GESMB*, p. 289 (10 June 1846)

⁵¹⁵ Isaac Nelson, *Letter from the Rev. Isaac Nelson, of Belfast, member of the Alliance* (New York, 1846)

⁵¹⁶ CM, "American Slavery" (19 August 1852), GES, *Tenth Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1844), p. 3 (see Smeal's hand-written notes from manuscript copy, William Smeal Collection), 17-22, -----. *Eleventh Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1845), p. 3, -----. *Twelfth Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1847), p. 3, -----. *Thirteenth Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1851), p. 3, *GESMB*, pp. 300-301 (7 June 1848), Michael Willis, *Slavery indefensible* (Glasgow, 1847)

⁵¹⁷ GES, *Tenth Annual Report*, p. 3, -----. *Eleventh Annual Report*, p. 3, -----. *Twelfth Annual Report*, p. 3, James Macbeth, *No fellowship with slaveholders* (Edinburgh, 1846), -----. *The church and the slaveholder* (Edinburgh, 1845), Shepperson, "The Free Church and American Slavery," pp. 140-141

⁵¹⁸ CM, "The Free Church and Voluntaryism" (2 May 1844)

As the years progressed, the Glasgow Emancipation Society would also suffer character assassination by adherents of the Free Church. This did little to waylay their efforts, within two years the campaign reached a feverish pitch—“Send Back the Money” became GES’s most active, comprehensive and costly offensive to date.⁵¹⁹ Bingham and Rice portray the episode as one characterised by personal vendettas and old sectarian hostilities. Both believed the ministerial reaction to Chalmers and FCS arose from old religious rivalries between Dissenting clergymen and the Church of Scotland over the debate on Voluntaryism. According to Rice, “The Send the Money Back campaign...was a classic example of the way in which Scotland used ‘events in the New World to bring into focus its own situation in the Old.’”⁵²⁰ In some respects, the clergymen that spoke on behalf of GES, most certainly reacted quite harshly to Chalmers’ apologist stance on the issue. As Bingham noted, Revs. S. Bates, George S. Ingram, and George Jeffrey seemingly demonstrated little anti-slavery interest prior to FCS controversy.⁵²¹ This may or may not have had something to do with latent animosity, which cannot be ignored; nonetheless, various mitigating factors suggest that GES’s policy was more clear-cut—strict adherence to Christian principles and respect for the Rights of Man.

Firstly, one of the chief GES instigators against FCS was Willis, a Free Church cleric. Besides Willis and Macbeth, FCS church elders Mr. Bonar of Larbet and Dr. Buchanan of Glasgow likewise espoused no fellowship with American slaveholding churches.⁵²² Secondly, the main clergymen involved in heated feuds with Chalmers over Voluntaryism in the 1830s—Heugh, King, and Wardlaw—resigned from the society and did not, like AFASS and BFASS, join the fray. Instead they collaborated with GES Revs. Anderson, Eadie, Lindsay and others concerning Christian union, the early days of the Evangelical Alliance. In fact, at the height of GES’s “Send Back the Money,” numerous Scottish ministers attended the Alliance, despite their respective denominations passing resolutions supporting the no fellowship rule. Rev. Macbeth clearly believed the movement condemning FCS’s official attitude towards American slavery, as defended by its main

⁵¹⁹ R. J. M. Blackett, *Building an Antislavery Wall* (Ithaca, 1983), pp. 94-96, GES, *Free Church alliance with manstealers*, pp. 14-17, H. C. Wright, *Christian communion with slave-holders, will the Alliance sanction it?* (Rochdale, 1846), James H. Hammond, *Letter of His Excellency Governor Hammond, to the Free Church of Glasgow, on the subject of slavery* (Columbia, 1844), *Scotsman*, “Free Presbytery of Greenock” (10 April 1844), Sidney E. Morse, *Letter on American slavery* (New York, 1847)

⁵²⁰ Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, pp. 177-178, Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, pp. 126-129, 146

⁵²¹ Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, p. 178. Jeffery, however, was the son-in-law of Dr. Ritchie, who assisted GES in opposing FCS.

⁵²² GH, “Glasgow Emancipation Society” (18 March 1844), Macbeth, *No fellowship*, pp. 3-4, J. F. Maclear, “The Evangelical Alliance,” pp. 151-156

leaders Drs. Candlish, Chalmers, and Cunningham, was not a “mob-clamour” or “enmity or agitation against the Free Church.”⁵²³

Both American antislavery societies, as well as BFASS, GES and other British anti-slavery societies, regarded the Free Church’s actions in accepting the money, while not remonstrating on slavery; and Chalmers subsequent apologetic defence of his American brethren, as damning to emancipation efforts. Anti-abolitionist and pro-slavery adherents in the US prolifically utilised Chalmers opinion in debates on the subject. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions employed Chalmers concept of “Organic Sin” (term coined by the Board) when rejecting calls for the group to officially condemn slaveholding as a sin. In an address to Dr. Leonard Woods and other ABCFM members, GES criticised the association’s usage of Chalmers arguments condoning slaveholders, as well as other apologist rhetoric from FCS leaders Candlish and Cunningham. In their eyes, the Board, by pardoning slaveholding Christians and admitting them as full church members, sanctioned slavery and made the system honourable.⁵²⁴ The Old School General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America, deeming slaveholding itself not a bar to Christian fellowship, cited Chalmers’ definition of abolitionism as a factious and innovative principle, contravening Scriptural authority and Apostolic example. Chalmers opinion apparently earned him the unqualified admiration of the “Old School” Presbyterians in the US. The Old General Assembly (1845 session) were exceedingly gratified with FCS’s apologist stance on slavery.⁵²⁵

Cincinnati Presbyterian, Nathan L. Rice often quoted Chalmers and Cunningham in numerous lectures and debates concerning slavery. In response to pro-slavery arguments quoting FCS’s ministers, one opponent noted most pro-slavery arguments were based on Scottish ecclesiastical authority. Rev. Leonard Bacon, another apologist, likewise quoted Chalmers defense of Christian slaveholders, insisting distinction should be made on the character of the person implicated in slavery, not the system itself. Those in America sympathetic to the slaveholding interest exploited the opinion of the great Scots divine to bolster their arguments. One of Chalmers’ correspondents, though, bemoaned the long-term effects on American church policy, claiming, “The ‘Old School’ Presbyterians claim

⁵²³ Macbeth, *No fellowship*, pp. 9-10, Maclear, “The Evangelical Alliance,” p. 152-156, Algernon S. Thelwall, *Proceedings of the Anti-Maynooth Conference* (London, 1845), pp. clxxxvi-clxxxvii

⁵²⁴ GES, *The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions*, -----, *Twelfth Annual Report*, p. 6

⁵²⁵ ABCFM, *Report of the Committee on Anti-Slavery Memorials* (Boston, 1845), p. 11-12, Nathan L. Rice, *Lectures on slavery* (Cincinnati, 1845), p. 6, Alexander T. McGill, *American Slavery* (Philadelphia, 1865), pp. 25-32).

you as one of their most able advocates in their views on slavery...Now it is said all over America that you go with the 'Old School' in support of slavery.”⁵²⁶

Even after the Doctor's death in 1847, the *American Presbyterian Review* hailed him for, “his noble vindication of this country, and especially of its Southern States, against the furious fanaticism of popular and ecclesiastical abolition outcry.”⁵²⁷ The reason for abolitionist outrage was clear. Had Chalmers been an American cleric, his discourse would have been negligible; yet, due to his status as a distinguished Minister of Great Britain, his opinion held considerable weight. Chalmers firmly sided with religious professors involved in the system and buoyed Northern pro-slavery clerics placed in an awkward position, all of which, according to Tappan, destroyed “what we have been attempting for 10 years to build up.”⁵²⁸ On the eve of Civil War conflict, Chalmers viewpoint, and the prestigious ABCFM's backing thereof, was still central to the debate on church fellowship.⁵²⁹

GES's response was fierce; their ideological war against the FCS had now taken a more militant and zealous tone. A public memorial condemning FCS's conduct as detrimental to the progress of abolition in America was distributed throughout the UK to ministers and ecclesiastical bodies, in which GES vowed to fight against “any Body of Christian Professors throwing themselves in the way.”⁵³⁰ In this sense, GES was showing its reformist leanings, which disregarded any religious partiality, in favour of strict abolitionist doctrine. Undoubtedly, the majority of GES were evangelicals; however, as in the case of their reform principles, they felt denominational connections, should not take precedence over anti-slavery aims. Slavery was a clear violation of man's birthright; to admit otherwise, would repudiate their own struggle to secure further social, religious and political rights for British citizens.

GES also renewed cooperation with the national anti-slavery society to tackle the FCS threat; BFASS member George W. Alexander met up with the Glasgow committee to

⁵²⁶ Blanchard and Rice, *A Debate on Slavery*, pp. 220-241, 280, 376, Nathan L. Rice, *Lectures on slavery* (Chicago, 1860), pp. 6, 10, 17, 24, 35, 59-60, 72, 157-158, George Shepperson, “Thomas Chalmers, The Free Church of Scotland, and the South,” *Journal of Southern History*, 17:4 (November, 1951), pp. 517-537

⁵²⁷ *American Presbyterian Review*, “The Late Dr. Chalmers,” I (December, 1847), pp. 71-76

⁵²⁸ L. Tappan to Sturge (15 November 1844), in Abel and Klingberg, *Sidelight*, pp. 196-200

⁵²⁹ Theodore Tilton, *The American Board and American Slavery* (Brooklyn, 1860), Rice, *Lectures on slavery* (Chicago edition), pp. 6, 10, 17, 59-60, Charles K. Whipple, *Relation of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to Slavery* (Boston, 1861), pp. 5-6, 44, 170-173

⁵³⁰ *GESMB*, pp. 267-269 (18 August 1844), p. 270 (10 February 1845)

discuss tactics, which was optimistically covered in *BASR*. Despite their past disputes, BFASS supported GES's agitation against the Free Church and "No Fellowship" policy.⁵³¹ Even at its early stages, the "Send the Money Back" campaign opposing FCS procured significant press—clerical and lay, which continued for several years, soliciting wide public attention for the cause and GES's efforts. Locally, the *Glasgow Herald* and *Argus* covered the movement; elsewhere in Scotland, the issue was reported by the *Aberdeen Journal*, *Caledonian Mercury*, *Dundee Courier*, *Dundee Warder*, *Edinburgh Advertiser*, *Northern Warder*, *Scottish Guardian*, *Scotsman*, and *Witness*. Nationally, various media likewise detailed the Glasgow abolitionist assault.⁵³²

By early 1846, the Glasgow Society welcomed American anti-slavery men James N. Buffum and Frederick Douglass. Wright had already flamed the debate by publishing several letters and tracts attacking the Free Church, some under the direction of GES, charging the church with abetting manstealers, "Your hands are full of blood!"⁵³³ The introduction of Buffum and Douglass, however, fortified GES's campaign. Buffum, an affluent and well-respected Massachusetts Quaker, quickly befriended eminent British philanthropists, the likes of Richard Cobden, John Bright, Daniel O'Connell, Edmund Quincy and Richard Webb. Douglass, with his astuteness and charismatic addresses, likewise drew large crowds and considerable media attention. The American trio of abolitionists toured Scotland—Ayr, Aberdeen, Dundee, Duntocher, Edinburgh, Greenock,

⁵³¹ *BASR*, "Mr. G. W. Alexander Conference with Committee of Glasgow Emancipation Society—April 15, 1845, Glasgow," VI (15 April 1845), "To Christian Ministers and Churches of Every Denomination," 6:2 (22 January 1845), BFASS, *American slavery. Address of the committee of the British and foreign anti-slavery society to the moderator, office bearers, and members of the General assembly of the Free church of Scotland* (London, 1846), *GESMB*, p. 271 (10 April 1845), pp. 272-275 (15 April 1845)

⁵³² *AJ*, "American Slavery and the Free Church" (4 December 1844), (29 April, 7 October 1846), *BFASR*, Glasgow Emancipation Society" (21 August, 11 December 1844), (22 January 1845), (30 April 1845), *Bradford Observer*, "The American Union; America Slavery; and the Free Church" (5 March 1846), *CM*, "American Slavery & the Free Church" (7, 11 May, 1, 8 June 1846), *DC*, "The Free Church and Slavery" (3, 31 December 1844), (March 18, May 12, 2, 9 June 1846), *Evangelical Repository*, "The Free Church of Scotland, and the Question of American Slavery" (August, 1846), pp. 199-201, *GA*, "The Slaveholders' Money and the Free Church" (21 November 1844), (24 March 1845), (1 May, 29 October 1846), *GESMB*, 283-284 (20 February 1846), *GH*, "Glasgow Emancipation Society" (18 March 1844), (20, 24 April, 2 October 1846), *Leeds Mercury*, "The Slaveholders' Money and the Free Church" (25 April 1846), *Manchester Times and Gazette*, "The Anti-Slavery Society and the Free Church" (29 May 1846), *Scottish Congregational Magazine*, "Critical Register" (April, 1846), p. 188, *Scotsman*, "Meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society" (20 March, 23 November, 2, 5, 19 December 1846), *The People's Journal*, "The Glasgow Emancipation Society," III (6 March 1847), p. 20, *USM*, "Monthly Retrospect" (January, 1845), p. 46

⁵³³ *GESMB*, pp. 283-284 (12 January 1846), Henry C. Wright, *American slavery proved to be theft and robbery* (Edinburgh, 1845), -----, *Manstealers: will the Free Church of Scotland hold Christian fellowship with them?* (Glasgow, 1845), Wright to *GA*, "A Man-Stealing Church" (24 March 1845)

Kilmarnock, Montrose, Paisley, Perth, and the Vale of Leven, at the behest of the Glaswegian society, arousing public interest in an attempt to force the Free Church's hand. GES was at the forefront of the controversy, the Edinburgh society dropping out early on due to conflicting interests within the association. According to GES records, the Edinburgh society was unwilling to publicly confront FCS, but still held several anti-slavery meetings, while honouring Buffum, Douglass, Thompson, and Wright with a Public Breakfast. During the Breakfast, Dr. Ritchie and John Wigham called for the Free Church to return the money. A letter from Mary Welsh of the Glasgow Female society stated EES, which had some Free Churchmen, were concerned with offending the FCS.⁵³⁴

As an educated former slave, Douglass brought a degree of credibility to the discussion. Drawing from his personal experience, he demonstrated how religion was manipulated to keep slaves obedient and ignorant of their own rights. On this point, certain parallels could be drawn between the condition of US slaves and the ignorant masses at home, especially in light of the proliferation of Chartist schools and churches in Scotland. Douglass explained that the FCS's deputation and stance on American slavery damaged the religious campaign against slavery. US pro-slavery journals were "laden with eulogies of Drs. Candlish and Cunningham, and the Free Church in general."⁵³⁵ Douglass's argument paralleled GES's—acceptance of such money and fellowship with those involved in the system was, in principle, partaking in the sinning of others, while elevating the slaveholder as a respectable Christian—

The Free Church is now proclaiming that these men—all blood-smeared as they are, with their stripes, gags, and thumb-screws, all the bloody paraphernalia of slaveholding, and who are depriving the slave of the right to learn and to read the word of God—that these men are Christians and ought to be in fellowship as such.⁵³⁶

Buffum and Wright were equally impressed by Scottish public sentiment against American slavery. Wright declared, "Scotland is in a blaze" over the FCS controversy, crediting GES for arousing popular sympathy. According to Buffum, everywhere they travelled,

⁵³⁴ BF, "The Slaveholders' Money, and the Free Church," 4:4 (30 April 1846), pp. 97-98, GES, *Free Church Alliance with Manstealers*, pp. 8, 24-29, 45-58, -----, *The Free Church and her accusers* (Glasgow, 1846), -----, *Twelfth Annual Report*, pp. 6-7, GESMB, p. 285 (10 April 1846), pp. 286-288 (21 April 1846), Mary Welsh to GES (25 April 1844), in Taylor, BAA, p. 217

⁵³⁵ GES, *Free Church Alliance with Manstealers*, pp. 19-24

⁵³⁶ Frederick Douglass, *The Life and Times of Frederick Douglass* (London, 1882), pp. 216-220, GES, *To Christian Ministers and Churches of Every Denomination* (Glasgow, 1844), Frederick Douglass, *The life and writings of Frederick Douglass*, ed. Phillip S. Foner, I (New York, 1950), p. 178

including areas of Free Church popularity, their censure of FCS was not questioned. In some instances, Free Church members espoused returning the money, even at a loss to them personally.⁵³⁷ GES's efforts paid significant dividends; the campaign against FCS was covered exclusively through several local and regional papers. The "Send Back the Money" slogan was reportedly "shouted night after night amidst the cheers of assembled thousands," documented by ballad singers and columnists, and brazenly transcribed upon city walls throughout the land. The controversy also yielded national and international attention, another commentator claiming, "from the Tweed to John O'Groats the Free Church became a hissing and a bye-word, so much so that you might have seen placarded around the streets of Edinburgh, "Send back the money—Send back the money.""⁵³⁸

The controversy pressured British religious bodies to decide on the fellowship question. By 1844, the Free Presbytery of Glasgow overruled the FCS General Assembly's opinion, unanimously deciding to withhold ecclesiastical fellowship and communication with American churches known to be involved with or encourage slavery. The following year the Reformed Presbyterian Church Synod resolved, "no church [was] justifiable in holding communion with those denominations in America that continue to countenance, in so many ways, an evil so flagrant as slavery."⁵³⁹ By 1846, the no fellowship policy had been adopted by the United Associate Synod. During this time, religious entities in Britain increasingly withdrew fellowship from slaveholders; yet, the FCS defended those involved with slavery, welcoming them in Christian communion.⁵⁴⁰

GES's agitation on the matter, which aroused huge popular support, certainly influenced various Scottish church bodies to renounce fellowship. Each time the Glasgow society campaigned for ecclesiastical accountability and action, most non-establishment churches

⁵³⁷ GES, *Free Church Alliance with Manstealers*, pp. 7-8, 24-29. Buffum noted, though, that only one person in Glasgow attempted to defend the FCS.

⁵³⁸ *AJ*, "Slavery and the Free Church" (29 April 1846), *GH*, "Frederick Douglass" (12 January 1846), "Public Meeting" (20 April 1846), "The Slaveholders' Money and the Free Church" (24 April 1846), *Liberator*, "John Murray and William Smeal to William Lloyd Garrison" (24 April 1846), *Leeds Mercury*, "The Slaveholders' Money and the Free Church" (25 April 1846), *Scotsman*, "Great Anti-Slavery Meeting" (24 January 1846), Tilton, *The American Board*, p. 19, Blackett, *Building an Antislavery Wall*, pp. 89-91, Shepperson, "The Free Church and American Slavery," p. 128, Rice, *Scot Abolitionists*, pp. 144-145

⁵³⁹ *Glasgow Free Church Presbytery Minutes 1843-48*, CH3/146/34 (4 December 1844), reprinted in Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, p. 179, *United Secession Magazine*, "Monthly Retrospect" (January, 1845), p. 46, Macbeth, *No fellowship*, pp. 8-10

⁵⁴⁰ *Evangelical Repository*, "The Free Church of Scotland, and the Question of American Slavery," pp. 199-201, Macbeth, *No fellowship with Slaveholders*, pp. 9-10, *Scotsman*, "United Associate Synod" (9 May 1846), George Thompson, *The Free Church of Scotland and American slavery* (Edinburgh, 1846), p. 11, GES, *Free Church Alliance with Manstealers*, pp. 9, 16, 23

reacted by remonstrating with American churches. GES's memorials to FCS, supported by similar addresses from BFASS and the Edinburgh Ladies Society, by mid-1846, likewise induced passionate debates within the Free Church; various FCS affiliates urged the General Assembly to repudiate fellowship with American churches involved in slavery.⁵⁴¹ The moral, or religious, argument espoused by GES exposed the hypocrisy of Christian involvement in slavery, including the continuance of fellowship with such brethren—from now on it was clear that anyone found wanting in their Christian duty, by condoning communion with “manstealers,” faced denunciation in the court of public opinion.

At the invite of the Glasgow society, Garrison arrived in late September to assist GES. Prior to leaving America, he addressed a black audience in Boston on his plans to “make the Free Church send back the blood stained money.” Several resolutions were adopted opposing FCS and fellowship with Christians complicit with slavery, entreating, “Our Anti-Slavery friends in Scotland to hear us through our beloved Garrison, and in the name of God and humanity let their watchword ever be, *No Union with Slaveholders*.”⁵⁴² The 1846 Annual American Anti-Slavery Society Convention praised the Glasgow Emancipation Society for publicly exposing the FCS. MASS abolitionists were also pleased with the progress of agitation against the Free Church, noting the Scottish religious bodies resolved against fellowship. Garrison began his mission in England with Thompson and Wright, touring large cities establishing Anti-Slavery League groups. One of the League's main objectives in Britain was to “outlaw from social responsibility and Christian fellowship...every American slave-holder and their allies and apologists.”⁵⁴³

By the time Garrison hit Glasgow, GES was in full-attack mode against the recently held Evangelical Alliance. The previous August several Scottish evangelical churchmen—lay and clerical—had issued a letter calling for a meeting of Evangelical Christians. This concept was directly in response to the perceived Catholic encroachments. Despite the presence of Candlish, Chalmers, Cunningham and other FCS members, notable anti-slavery adherents also promoted the idea. On the surface the proposal sought to do exactly

⁵⁴¹ CM, “Free Church Assembly” (1 June 1846), *Scotsman*, “General Assembly of the Free Church—Report and Overtures on American Slavery” (3 June 1846). Thompson, Buffum and Douglass were present, representing GES. Three overtures were presented on US slavery—Synod of Sutherland and Caithness; Synod of Angus and Mearns; and the Dundee FC elders, deacons, and members; two of which called for withholding communion.

⁵⁴² GESMB, pp. 285-286 (20 April 1846), pp. 289-291 (21 September 1846), HASS, *Proceedings of a crowded meeting of the colored population of Boston* (Dublin, 1846), pp. 11-14

⁵⁴³ Garrison to Wright (1 June 1846), in WLG, *Letters*, III, p. 339, MASS, *Fourteenth Annual Report* (Boston, 1846), pp. 93-94, Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, pp. 183-184, Henry C. Wright, *Christian communion with slave-holders*, p. 4

what it stated, to repress the Catholic threat seen as stemming from various sociopolitical events: Irish emigration, the Maynooth Grant, the Oxford Movement, and Puseyism. Scots and English evangelicals sought to strengthen Protestant unity by reaffirming Anglo-American church ties. Rev. John Angell James, the leader of the Liverpool Conference of the EA, joined forces with Dr. Wardlaw (ex-GES Vice-President) in advocating such ties, especially since both had numerous friends and admirers in the US. James, Wardlaw, and Chalmers were likewise concerned about Presbyterian unity in the US. Recent anti-slavery and other doctrinal dissensions had divided the main Protestant American denominations, threatening to further split stateside churches along the Mason Dixon line.⁵⁴⁴ James's attacks on Garrison's "infidel" religious beliefs; Wardlaw's severing ties with the AASS's "ultraist" stance; and Chalmers' denouncement of modern abolitionism, while vindicating fellowship with Southern churches; all mirrored the reaction of their transatlantic brethren in response to abolition in America. Apologist and pro-slavery churchmen, as well as some alleged anti-slavery clerics, banded together to defend the American church and to preserve the Union. In a letter to Chalmers, eminent New Yorker James Lenox noted,

Our Church in the South is felt by a very large number of the ministry there to depend upon their resisting the attempt to make the holding of a slave a test of communion...it will cripple our church; and if the same line be drawn through other evangelical bodies, our political union will fall to pieces, and war between brethren probably be the consequence.⁵⁴⁵

Although the April pre-conference meeting in Birmingham had approved a motion meant to exclude slaveholders from attending, a similar motion was defeated at the London convention. Dr. Chalmers objected to the Birmingham motion, believing some,

Whether by their own fault or otherwise, may be in the unhappy position of holding their fellowmen as slaves...the laying on of such a stigma is an act of cruelty and injustice to those ministers...a party of *injudicious* abolitionists in America who have greatly *distempered* and *retarded* the cause of emancipation; and let us not give way to the *fanatic outcry* that they are attempting to excite throughout the *misled* and *deluded* multitudes of *our own land*.⁵⁴⁶

⁵⁴⁴ Thelwall, *Anti-Maynooth Conference*, pp. clxxxvi-clxxxvii, Blackett, *Building an Antislavery Wall*, pp. 97-103, David Christy, *Pulpit Politics*, pp. 343-548, Wright, *Christian communion with slave-holders*

⁵⁴⁵ James Lenox to Chalmers (27 March 1845), quoted in Shepperson, "Thomas Chalmers," pp. 527-528

⁵⁴⁶ *EC*, "Evangelical Alliance" (December, 1846), pp. 760-761, *English Presbyterian Messenger*, "The Evangelical Alliance," I (July, 1846), pp. 244-245, Thomas Chalmers, *On the Evangelical Alliance* (Edinburgh, 1846), pp. 38-40, *EC*, "Evangelical Alliance," pp. 760-761

In response to the objections of a number of American delegates, Dr. Wardlaw proposed the Evangelical Alliance disregard slaveholding as a bar to membership. This was a complete change of heart from Wardlaw's stance in 1834, when he suggested fellowship should cease with American Christians involved in slavery. Back then the Doctor looked to Dr. Thomson for inspiration, the late Church of Scotland leader who proclaimed himself an avowed immediatist, refusing to countenance or partake in others people's guilt. Even Dr. Cunningham, the FCS's most virulent defender, sanctioned the no fellowship policy of Rev. Bourne when writing the foreword to Bourne's *Picture of Slavery* (Glasgow edition) in 1835.⁵⁴⁷ Former GES committeeman Dr. King, though, early on emphatically opposed ex-communication, believing Christians in those circumstances "must have felt some difficulties and perplexities about it, that he did not feel." He continued to support this same line of reasoning concerning slaveholder admittance for the Evangelical Alliance. Chalmers had always taken a moderate, fairly sympathetic view to slaveholding and slaveholders; his anti-slavery opinion in 1824 remained consistent with his sentiments of the 1840s.⁵⁴⁸

The Glasgow society pre-empted the EA's stance on slaveholders, leading the British anti-slavery response to the Alliance. After carefully scrutinising the initial Liverpool 1845 meeting, noting some allusion to American slavery, GES pressured EA into withholding membership from slaveholders. British conference members, religious bodies and the public were advised of the situation by GES, who widely circulated an address against the inclusion of slaveholders. The *Scottish Congregational Magazine* noted,

This watchful and active Society have done well to be beforehand in this representation. We confidently anticipate that, by a stern exclusion of every representative of a slave-holding church from their conference, another protest will be uttered against that most enormous blot upon human nature, SLAVERY IN America.⁵⁴⁹

⁵⁴⁷ Bourne, *Picture of Slavery* (Glasgow edition), foreword, *EC*, "Evangelical Alliance" (December, 1846), pp. 750, 760-763, *English Presbyterian Messenger*, "The Evangelical Alliance," I (July, 1846), pp. 244-245, Thomas Chalmers, *On the Evangelical Alliance*, pp. 38-40, GES, *Free Church Alliance with Manstealers*, pp. 29-37, Thomson, *Slavery not sanctioned*

⁵⁴⁸ Chalmers, *A few thoughts on the abolition of colonial slavery*, -----, *On the Evangelical Alliance*, pp. 38-40, *English Presbyterian Messenger*, "The Evangelical Alliance," pp. 244-245, GES, *Fourth Annual Report*, p. 30

⁵⁴⁹ *BF*, "The Evangelical Alliance" (February, 1846), pp. 44-45, *EC*, "Evangelical Alliance," p. 760, GES, *The Evangelical Alliance. Will Slaveholders be admitted to Membership in it?*, pp. 1-16, *GESMB*, pp. 281-282 (5 November 1845), *Scottish Congregational Magazine*, "The Evangelical Alliance. Will Slaveholders be admitted to Membership in it? Letter from the Committee of the Glasgow Emancipation Society. Glasgow. 1845," New Series, VI (April, 1846), p. 188

BFASS belatedly followed GES's lead and the following year, also communicated its objections to slaveholder participation. Thomas Clarkson likewise weighed in on the matter, upholding GES and Wright's no fellowship argument, stating, "If we cannot punish them, let us at least try to bring them to shame."⁵⁵⁰ The Birmingham motion temporarily waylaid further GES action against the Alliance, however, the campaign against the Free Church continued unabated.⁵⁵¹

Directly following the conclusion of the Alliance, word spread quickly amongst the press and anti-slavery circles that British brethren had conceded to American pressure on the membership restrictions against slaveholders. The Glasgow members were surprised and disappointed by Dr. Wardlaw's seemingly lame defence of the measure, which appeared to place a higher priority on Evangelical unity than anti-slavery principle.⁵⁵² Thompson, especially, was dismayed that his old friend and abolitionist ally Wardlaw had not taken the high road on the issue of fellowship. During the "Great Public Meeting" held at City Hall on 28 October 1846 condemning the "pro-slavery" actions of the Free Church and the Evangelical Alliance, Thompson admonished Wardlaw and rejected the Doctor's "unapologetic letter" defending the Alliance's actions. Garrison reported the meeting as being "one of the largest and most enthusiastic...that I have seen on this side of the Atlantic."⁵⁵³

Following its own investigation of the Alliance's published documents, the *Eclectic Review* denounced the late conference, regretting Wardlaw stood "voucher" for the US delegates. It further accused the Free Church of orchestrating the whole scenario to vindicate their church from the impropriety of receiving slaveholder donations, which mirrored GES's stance on the matter. According to the journal, "The religious press, with a few solitary exceptions, has spoken of its [the Alliance's] proceedings in terms of severe

⁵⁵⁰ Clarkson to Thompson (23 April 1845), reprinted in *Free Church of Scotland and American slavery*, pp. 62-72, Evangelical Alliance, *Report of the proceedings of the Conference held at Freemason's Hall London* (London, 1847), pp. xxviii-xl

⁵⁵¹ GES, *Free Church Alliance with Manstealers*, pp. 7, 9-29, 37, *GESMB*, pp. 286-288 (21 April 1846)

⁵⁵² *AJ*, "American Slavery, the Free Church, and the Evangelical Alliance" (7 October 1846), *CM*, "American Slavery, the Free Church, and the Evangelical Alliance" (5 October 1846), *GH*, "American Slavery, the Free Church, and the Evangelical Alliance" (2 October 1846), *EC*, "Evangelical Alliance," pp. 774-776, *GESMB*, pp. 290-294 (30 September 1846), pp. 293-294 (28 October 1846), *MASS*, *Fifteenth Annual Report* (Boston, 1847), pp. 39-57, Wright to Wardlaw (31 October 1846), in Wright, *Christian communion with slave-holders*, pp. 6-12

⁵⁵³ Garrison to Richard D. Webb (29 October 1846), in *WLG*, *Letters*, III, p. 447, *GESMB*, pp. 293-294 (28 October 1846), *GA*, "Great Anti-Slavery Meeting" (29 October 1846)

censure.”⁵⁵⁴ The outcome was clear, the Glasgow abolitionists were not alone in their outrage of the Evangelical Alliance’s compromise on slavery. GES’s high-profile campaign against the FCS and the Evangelical Alliance exposed the controversy on a national scale, arousing popular opinion, clerical and lay, against both entities. In the weeks following the conference, over fifty British Alliance members resigned from the association. As Rev. Nelson explained, “The Alliance did not nobly and straightforwardly do its duty. It has not taken a decided stand, and spoken out as it ought on this flagrant atrocity. It yielded for the sake of unity...brought itself under well-merited censure.”⁵⁵⁵

The initial enthusiasm displayed by Scottish evangelicals for Christian union, however, had slowly eroded well before the demise of the Evangelical Alliance. Only a handful of anti-slavery adherents originally supporting the idea actually attended the conference—no doubt dismayed by Birmingham’s “Candlish Compromise” in relation to slaveholding. Those who did participate were, not surprisingly, associates of Heugh, King and Wardlaw. The former GES committeemen were still strongly anti-slavery; yet, in their enthusiasm for Protestant union, they completely ignored the issue of American Christian ties to slavery. Wardlaw reluctantly addressed the issue in a speech to the EA assembly, firmly upholding slavery as a sin, although he flatly refused to “pronounce any sentence” on the personal Christianity of slaveholders.⁵⁵⁶

Other than the attendance of Dr. Kidston, who had long advocated interdenominational cooperation, it appears that several GES evangelicals avoided the Alliance due to its concessionary attitude towards Christian slaveholders, which directly conflicted with their moral and religious abolitionist views. During conference proceedings, one Scottish minister alluded to such, confidently declaring that if the motion excluding slaveholders was amended or withdrawn to satisfy the Americans, then the Alliance would, “with few exceptions, lose the whole of the Scottish Dissenters.”⁵⁵⁷ On a national level, too, the anti-slavery community in Britain felt betrayed by their ministerial cohorts, who, in their opinion, placed the weight of Anglo-American ecclesiastical relations above the plight of the slave. Resigning his membership, Dr. Andrew Reed declared,

⁵⁵⁴ EC, “Evangelical Alliance”, pp. 774-776, 759-760, GES, *Twelfth Annual Report*, p. 9

⁵⁵⁵ EC, “Evangelical Alliance,” pp. 777-778, Nelson, *Letter from the Rev. Isaac Nelson*.

⁵⁵⁶ Evangelical Alliance, *Report of the proceedings*, pp. lxiii-lxv, lxxvii-xcvii, 322-325, Thelwall, *Anti-Maynooth Conference*, pp. clxxxvi-clxxxvii

⁵⁵⁷ Evangelical Alliance, *Report of the proceedings*, pp. 430-431

The Conference resolved unanimously, and under a strange ecstasy of mind, that slavery may be not only legal, but right; not only right, but in certain circumstances beneficial to the slave...the vital interest of the slave are damaged, and, as far as possible, made questionable...if good is to be set against evil, the Alliance must realise a larger amount of good than the most sanguine of its friends will readily ascribe to it, to outweigh this enormous evil.⁵⁵⁸

GES remained hostile to the Free Church and the Evangelical Alliance, continuing agitation against both bodies well into the New Year. During their annual meeting, the committee reaffirmed its avowal to oppose any and all persons, secular or otherwise, who countenanced slavery.⁵⁵⁹ The Glasgow Society's campaign to expose EA and FCS elicited mixed results—the British branch of the Alliance resolving to withhold membership from slaveholders, while FCS stubbornly refused to return the “blood money” or renounce fellowship—however, the agitation successfully renewed popular interest in American slavery, the episode garnered the society much needed publicity and support during a time when abolitionist sentiment was flagging. The committee never wavered in their depreciation of Christian ministers complicit with slavery and, from time to time, public denunciations of visiting American ministers continued to provoke impassioned public reactions throughout Scotland. As usual, Murray and Smeal headed GES's agitation, demonstrated in one such placard, placed “on every public corner, in a city containing 340,000 inhabitants,” stating,

The Glasgow Emancipation Society deem it their duty to warn their Fellow-citizens regarding the Rev. A. Campbell, of Virginia...This individual has long been, and is now, an unscrupulous advocate and apologist for American man-stealers, slave-holders, separators of husbands and wives, and cradle plunderers.

Citizens of Glasgow—You have long since decided for “no union with slaveholders, either civil or ecclesiastical.” Indignantly tell this man, and every apologist for man-stealers, that you scorn, condemn, and loath all who, like him, meanly and impiously attempt to prove that the New Testament sanctions turning their fellow-man, made in the image of God, and of the same blood with themselves, into a slave, a chattel, a thing, a piece of property like a beast. No confidence is, or ever will be, placed by Britons in the Christianity, or the exposition of Christianity, by man-stealers, their apologists, or their abettors, who have not even learned that the chief and fundamental principles of Christianity, are to love mercy and do justly—in short, to do to all men as we

⁵⁵⁸ Dr. Reed's letter of resignation from the Evangelical Alliance reprinted in *EC*, “Evangelical Alliance”, pp. 777-778

⁵⁵⁹ GES, *Twelfth Annual Report*, pp. 8-10, 18-22, 26-28, *GESMB*, pp. 294-297 (1 February 1847), MASS, *Sixteenth Annual Report* (Boston, 1848), pp. 35-37

would they should do to us.⁵⁶⁰

The fellowship controversy involving EA and FCS clearly irked certain British ecclesiastical factions. Charges of infidelity were once again applied to Garrison and his fellow Anti-Slavery League cohorts, Douglass, Thompson and Wright, by religious commentators in Britain. Others blamed the abolitionists for stirring up public sentiment against the Alliance and, in particular, Dr. Wardlaw, as a means to exonerate British brethren from the failed conference. The British branch of the Alliance clearly resented the interference of the ASL and under increasing public censure, chose to exclude membership from slaveholders, despite disagreement from several prominent members. The assembly, however, modified the Birmingham decision, resolving to withhold judgement on the personal Christianity of such men; the same compromise Wardlaw himself proposed during the London conference.⁵⁶¹

In Scotland, the Christian fellowship issue remained volatile. In the years prior to Civil War, Drs. Candlish and Cunningham vehemently refused to countenance GES's stance against communion with slaveholders. It most certainly had nothing to do with money, since Southern donations were a mere drop in the bucket compared with the amounts raised by FCS after the Disruption. It had more to do with the rivalry between FCS and the Church of Scotland. When the seceders left, they lost the prestige and legacy attached to the Scottish Kirk, which was admired by American Protestants. Avoiding the slavery issue was an obvious ploy by FCS leaders to avoid alienating their transatlantic brethren, especially in the South and New York area where donations were solicited. On the home front, Scottish Voluntaries, like King and Wardlaw, who sidestepped the slavery issue, did

⁵⁶⁰ In August 1847, American Rev. Alexander Campbell was publicly shamed by GES, who published a Bill against the minister and posted notices through the city—Edinburgh Anti-Slavery Society, *People of Scotland Beware!!* (Edinburgh, 1847), *GESMB*, p. 290 (21 September 1846), p. 298 (25 August 1847). Campbell wrote about his treatment at the hands of the Edinburgh and Glasgow abolitionists in his magazine, *British Millennial Harbinger*, "Letters from Europe" and "Letter to 'brother Campbell' from AC," Series III, 5:2 (February, 1848). In early 1850, GES refused to officially recognize former slave, Rev. James W. C. Pennington of NY, due to his churches affiliation with the American Presbyterian Church, which admitted slaveholders, *GESMB*, pp. 301-302 (31 February 1849). GES also forwarded a circular urging church bodies to not accept US Revs. Bishop Simpson and Dr. McClintock, representatives of slaveholding churches, *GESMB*, pp. 323-325 (27 July 1857).

⁵⁶¹ Garrison to the Editor of the *Christian Witness* (4 December 1846), in WLG, *Letters*, III, pp. 455-460, *Manchester Times*, "The Evangelical Alliance and the Anti-Slavery Advocates," reprinted in *Scotsman* (28 October 1846), *Scotsman*, "The Evangelical Alliance" (11 November 1846), *The "Christian Witness" examined on a defamatory charge of infidelity against William Lloyd Garrison* (London, 1847), *USM*, "The Evangelical Alliance and American Slavery," pp. 553-554. The *Christian Witness*, the official organ of the Congregational Union of England, edited by Dr. John Campbell, charged Garrison and AASS with "infidelity."

so in support of the secessionist FCS, which was seen as a vindication of the separation of Church and State principle. In their struggle against the CoS, the old Voluntaries were more than willing to align themselves with their former adversaries, Candlish, Chalmers and Cunninghame.

The Anti-Slavery League, headed by Thompson as a conduit for Garrison's no fellowship doctrine, came about through the exertions of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, who not only initiated the FCS controversy but also invited Garrison to bolster their campaign. Despite the numerous attacks on Garrison and his associates, the press and several prominent British abolitionists came out in defence of the League, denouncing the Evangelical Alliance's conduct with regards to communion with slaveholding Christians. John Wigham defended Garrison and the Edinburgh Anti-Slavery Society presented him with a silver-plated tea set. Years on, the *Dundee Courier* was still chastising the Free Church and its adherents for its communion with Southern churches and inconsistency on slavery; its lamentable treatment of Garrison and his party; all of which, in their opinion, strengthened the slavery cause in America.⁵⁶² Even publications critical of Garrison protested against "the construction put on his language by some of our contemporaries, as wanting in justice to him."⁵⁶³ The dispute resulted in the formation of an anti-slavery group within the Free Church, attracting other denominational ministers into the abolitionist fold. The FCASS held numerous meetings and lectures to educate the public on the issue of Christian communion and, according to FCS Archdeacon Williams, "in five years hence not a Free Churchman would dare to address a meeting...and say that an American slaveholder ought to be acknowledged as a Christian by any man who called himself a Christian."⁵⁶⁴

⁵⁶² BF, "Letter to the Editors," 4:11 (30 November 1846), "The 'Christian Witness' Examined," 5:1 (30 January 1847), DC, "American Slavery-Letter from William Lloyd Garrison to the Glasgow Emancipation Society" (21 July 1846), GESMB, pp. 285-286 (20 April 1846), *Howitt's Journal*, "The 'Christian Witness' Examined," I (London, 1847), p. 137, *Liverpool Mercury*, "The Anti-Slavery League versus the Evangelical Alliance and the Free Church of Scotland" (23 October 1846), Maclear, "The Evangelical Alliance," pp. 160-161, *Morning Chronicle*, "The Anti-Slavery League and the Evangelical Alliance" (14 October 1846), Nelson, *Letter from the Rev. Isaac Nelson*, pp. 1-4, *Scotsman*, "Anti-Slavery Meeting" (24 October 1846), "Anti-Slavery—Anti-Slavery League" (28 October 1846), DC, "Slavery in America" (16 May 1849), "The American Churches and Slavery" (6 July 1853).

⁵⁶³ EC, "Evangelical Alliance," pp. 776-778

⁵⁶⁴ George Jeffrey, *The pro-slavery character of the American churches, and the sin of holding Christian communion with them* (Edinburgh, 1847), GES, *Twelfth Annual Report*, p. 22, *Scotsman*, "Free Church and Slavery" (2 December 1846), "Free Church Anti-Slavery Society" (5 December 1846), "Free Church Anti-Slavery Society" (19 December 1846), "Lecture on Slavery" (26 December 1846), "Free Church Anti-Slavery Society Annual Meeting" (12 May 1847)

The fellowship controversy successfully highlighted the quandary of British communion with American churches implicated in slavery, resulting in the UK branch abandoning its pursuit of transatlantic solidarity. The ecclesiastical censures continued unabated, even FCS eventually relented, sending its own remonstrance; yet, British apprehensiveness concerning American Christianity persisted well into the Civil War period.⁵⁶⁵ As for Scotland, during the 1850s, abolitionists continued to advocate no fellowship with American churches and by 1863, over one thousand Scottish ministers (various denominations, including FCS and GES ministers) signed an address to the Confederate Southern Clergy condemning their continued support for the slave system, which was, in their opinion, “founded on wrong and crime, and as deserving, not his [God’s] blessing, but his righteous wrath.”⁵⁶⁶

Thoughts on Disunion, Uncle Tom, and the American Civil War

In May 1844, the American Anti-Slavery Society, presided over by Garrison, officially endorsed the political and religious policy of “No Union with Slaveholders.” Since 1842, this idea disseminated within the Garrisonian camp in response to the rise of “Slave Power” in national politics. Abolitionists for the past five years had been subjected to Congress’s gag rule, prohibiting anti-slavery petitions being read in the House. In *Prigg v. Pennsylvania* the Supreme Court, pre-empting the Fugitive Slave Law, declared slaveholders constitutionally had the right to recapture fugitive slaves in the Northern states without obstruction. During the same period, Southern pro-slavery sympathizer, President John Tyler and his administration began secret talks with Texas with the view to expand the slave territories. The original concept of “Disunion” emphasised one’s personal withdrawal from union with slaveholders by non-participation in political action—voting, holding offices, or any civil post requiring oaths of loyalty to the Constitution, which protected the slave interest.⁵⁶⁷ Garrisonians continued their disunion rhetoric well into the 1850s due to repetitive political anti-slavery defeats: the failed 1847

⁵⁶⁵ Maclear, “The Evangelical Alliance,” pp. 160-162. The FCS’ Dr. Candlish joined Dr. Ritchie and John Wigham in 1854 to form the “New” Edinburgh Anti-Slavery Society, ENASS, *Edinburgh Anti-Slavery Society—Statement* (Edinburgh, 1854)

⁵⁶⁶ BASR, “The Scotch Clergy and the Southern Ministers’ Apology for Slaveholding,” 12:1 (1 January 1864), CM, “American Slavery” (30 October 1855), *Reply to the Addresses of the Confederate Clergy on Slavery* (October, 1863), reprinted in United States Department of State, *Papers Relating to Foreign Affairs*, 4:2 (Washington, D.C., 1863), pp. 1253-1255. The letter was also printed in the *London Daily News* (3 November 1863)

⁵⁶⁷ GES, *Eleventh Annual Report*, pp. 3-4, -----. *No Union with Slaveholders*, -----. *Tenth Annual Report*, pp. 14, 41-45, *Liberator*, “The New England Anti-Slavery Convention Presentation of the Standard” (16 August 1844), William Caleb McDaniel, *Our Country is the World: Radical American Abolitionists Abroad* (PhD, John Hopkins University, 2006), pp. 222-269

Wilmot Proviso, banning slavery from Mexican territories; the Compromise of 1850, including the Fugitive Slave Law, enforceable by Federal authority; the 1854 Kansas-Nebraska Act that repealed the Missouri Compromise, limiting slavery in the Louisiana Purchase area, and the Dred Scott decision of 1857.⁵⁶⁸

The political aspect coincided with the “Come-Outerism” movement—abolitionists wanting to distance themselves from churches involved or countenancing slavery. Although this idea is often attributed to Garrison, it was taken up by fellow anti-slavery adherent William Goodell and perfectionist reformer John Humphrey Noyes. In July 1851, the Christian Anti-Slavery Convention held in Chicago also endorsed the “come-outer” stance in relation to churches implicated in the sin of slavery. Under the same precept, abolitionists James G. Birney and Gerrit Smith, left their respective church (Presbyterian) to form an independent, abolitionist congregation. Come-Outers were convinced that one could not,

Maintain a connection with a corrupt church without becoming a partaker of his sins, and receiving her plagues...a professed Christian church is the association to whom the universal principle of holding the members responsible for the acts of the body, should be most faithfully applied.⁵⁶⁹

GES’s no fellowship campaign against the Evangelical Alliance and the Free Church paralleled this same sentiment, stressing moral and religious imperatives for separating themselves from communion with Slaveholders.

AASS and GES promoted disunion based on both political and religious principles. Just as British churches withdrawing communion from their transatlantic brethren coerced some American ecclesiasts to reconsider their moral duty in relation to slavery; US abolitionists viewed political disunion as a means of forcing the South to abolish slavery. John Quincy Adams had already presented a petition in the House of Representatives calling for immediate measures to dissolve the Union peacefully. The Haverhill, Massachusetts document, viewed as the impetus for Garrison’s ideology, rankled Southern politicians.

⁵⁶⁸ Rogan Kersh, *Dreams of a More Perfect Union* (Ithaca, 2001), pp. 153-197, Herbert J. Levine, “Union and Disunion in ‘Song of Myself,’” *American Literature*, 59:4 (December, 1987), pp. 570-589, *Liberator*, “Dred Scott and Disunion” (12 March 1858), Elizabeth R. Varon, *Disunion!: the Coming of the American Civil War* (Chapel Hill, 2008), pp. 150-164

⁵⁶⁹ *BASR*, “Christian Anti-Slavery Convention,” 6:72 (December, 1851), pp. 190-191, Budney, William Jay, pp. 79-80, William Goodell, *Come-Outerism: The Duty of Secession From a Corrupt Church* (New York, 1845), pp. 16-18, John R. McKivigan, *The War against Proslavery Religion: Abolitionism and the Northern Churches* (Ithaca, 1984), pp. 131-135, McDaniel, *Our Country is the World*, p. 228

Joseph Underwood of Kentucky deduced that a dissolved Union would ruin slavery by opening up borders to fleeing fugitive slaves, in other words, “The dissolution of the Union was the dissolution of slavery.”⁵⁷⁰ Despite this, anti-slavery historians tended to view Garrison’s disunion views as a crusade for secession, based on his perfectionist and moral purity ideas. Not all disunionists were Perfectionists, though, as demonstrated by Wendell Phillips; and some pacifists actually saw disunion as inconsistent with non-resistance because of its political nature.⁵⁷¹ Henry Ward Beecher, lecturing around Britain during the Civil War, understood Garrisonian motives for disunion, stating,

They regarded slavery as so established, and the institutions of the country as so controlled by its advocates, that all remedy was hopeless, and they urged an *utter separation from the South*, as the only way of freeing the North from the guilt and contamination of slavery. There was no *political* difference between Mr. Garrison’s disunion and Mr. [Jefferson] Davis’s secession. But the *moral* difference was world wide. The disunionists of the Garrison and Wendell Phillips school were seeking to promote liberty and to weaken slavery. Mr. Davis and his followers are seeking to strengthen slavery and to restrict liberty.⁵⁷²

After the Old American society adopted “No Union with Slaveholders,” GES quickly followed suit, printing Wright’s *Dissolution of the American Union*, which touched on the issue of Christian fellowship, but mainly focused on the annexation of Texas, Constitutional dictates that legitimised slavery, and the inability of slaves to petition or have rights to a jury trial, as citizens of the US. The Glasgow committee memorialised their assent to “No Union” urging US citizens to exercise their right and duty to withdraw from the Union, to no longer “strengthen the hands of tyrants, and make the name of liberty a by-word throughout the earth...annul your religious and political compact with American Slavery.”⁵⁷³ This directly reflected Garrison’s ideological distinction between the false Union, a “hollow mockery” backed by the Constitution, and the “glorious reality” of the true Union that had yet to be realised. George Thompson also argued that the Constitution upheld slavery in a series of debates with Frederick Douglass in 1860. A few

⁵⁷⁰ McDaniel, *Our Country is the World*, pp. 250-252. The Haverhill petition was presented on 24 January 1842. Quote from Underwood taken from *The Congressional Globe*, 27th Congress, 2nd Session, 168 (1842) reprinted in *Our Country*.

⁵⁷¹ William C. McDaniel, “Repealing Unions: American Abolitionists, Irish Repeal, and the Origins of Garrisonian Disunionism,” *Journal of the Early Republic*, 28:2 (Summer, 2008), pp. 243-269, McDaniel, *Our Country is the World*, p. 246, Wendell Phillips, *Speech of Wendell Phillips, Esq. in Vindication of the Course Pursued by the American Abolitionists* (London, 1853)

⁵⁷² Henry Ward Beecher, *American Rebellion* (Manchester, 1864), p. 34

⁵⁷³ GES, *Memorial from the People of Great Britain and Ireland to the People of the Non-Slave States of America* (Glasgow, 1845), *GESMB*, pp. 274-277 (17 July 1845), 278-279 (17 October 1845), 281-282 (5 November 1845), Henry C. Wright, *The Dissolution of the American Union* (Glasgow, 1845)

years earlier, Douglass split with Garrison on the issue of disunion and, upon returning to Scotland, choose to side with many of the same conservative clergy (now espousing anti-slavery) he had once denounced for fellowship in 1846.⁵⁷⁴

Considering the reformist tendencies of various GES members—Mssrs. Murray, A. Paton, Smeal, Turner and Revs. Anderson, Jeffrey and McTear, in particular—it is not surprising the committee whole-heartedly embraced not only the moral impulse of disunion, but the political impetus. In its current state, the Glasgow abolitionists viewed the Federal Administration as a “Slave Holding Government,” seeking to extend and perpetuate slave territories, while its Constitution validated the practice of slaveholding, which was “the gigantic enemy of Freedom and the rights of man.”⁵⁷⁵ In its formative years, the Glasgow society depreciated the hypocrisy of the Declaration of Independence, which declared all men were entitled to the inalienable rights of “life, Liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,” yet, clearly this privilege only extended to white males. The committee’s goals for the emancipation of US slaves, in their eyes, paralleled efforts in Britain to advance personal and national liberty.⁵⁷⁶ As discussed in Chapter II, the appeal for universal emancipation ran concurrent with the reformist and Voluntary campaigns of the early 1830s; a significant portion of the Glasgow committee were actively involved in both pursuits. GES records show that at least twenty-three members, most involved in social and political reform, continually supported the society for three decades prior to Civil War—several were life-long members and subscribers, such as Rev. William Anderson, James Beith, William Craig, John Fleming, Robert Grahame, Rev. Alexander Harvey, Rev. William Kidston, John Maxwell, Rev. James McTear, John McLeod, John Murray, Robert Sanderson, William Smeal, James Turner, and George Watson.

Undoubtedly there were those critics of the United States that often used the example of slavery to denounce democracy and republicanism; nonetheless, GES sought to re-establish America as a beacon of Liberty; a positive influence in current world politics and a practical specimen of the universal rights of man—

And were the Americans generally aware that those who are exerting themselves in this country, to increase her fame and moral influence among the nations, and ameliorate the condition of millions of her degraded population,

⁵⁷⁴ GH, “Present Crisis of American Slavery,” (29 February 1860), Varon, *Disunion*, pp. 153-154, Frederick Douglass and George Thompson, *Constitution of the United States* (London, 1860).

⁵⁷⁵ GES, *Eleventh Annual Report*, pp. 3-5

⁵⁷⁶ GES, *First Annual Report*, p.8, -----, *Second Annual Report*, pp. 15

are those who hate tyranny in every form, who are struggling at home for equal religious and civil rights for all, and who would fondly point to America as a glorious example of what universal and unrestricted freedom can achieve for a people.⁵⁷⁷

Like Garrison, the Glasgow society viewed the increasing legalisation of “Slave Power” as detrimental to universal civil and religious liberty, not just concerning the enslaved and coloured population of the US, but its bearing on civilian rights in Britain. During this period, Glaswegian reformers once again pushed for extended franchise and equal representation. The Glasgow Parliamentary Reform Association headed by several GES committeemen, in cooperation with radicals like John and William McAdam, rallied together to oppose further Ministerial measures to restrict civil and political rights. GPRA members bemoaned the reluctance of aristocratic liberals, including Lord John Russell, to extend the franchise to the working class. There was a general belief that, despite some reforms, British elites continued to monopolize government policies, which increasingly encroached upon the rights of the labouring class. The passing of the Fugitive Slave Bill also heightened these fears. The cause of emancipation in America seemed to be backsliding, uprooted by the very laws and government of a pre-eminently “free” Republic. Clear parallels could be drawn between the threat of “Slave Power” in the US, which impeded the personal liberties of coloured Americans and abolitionists, while maintaining a hierarchical social system, and the aristocracy in Britain who increasingly looked consolidate their power by legislating repressive measures that disenfranchised the masses. GES condemned the Fugitive Slave Bill, seen opening the whole country—Free and Slave states—to “manhunters and manstealers, in direct contradiction to the Declaration of their Constitution.”⁵⁷⁸ In defiance of the bill, the society publicly offered to protect fugitive slaves in Scotland, as in the case of William Wells Brown, and William and Ellen Craft, while advocating the dissolution of the American Union.⁵⁷⁹

The idea of political and religious disunion most certainly concerned conservative Scottish anti-slavery men. By 1852, several dissenting ministers, including Dr. Wardlaw, formed the Glasgow New Anti-Slavery Society, considered a respectable base for abolitionist activity versus the radical endeavours of GES, making the new association more appealing

⁵⁷⁷ *Bradford Observer*, “The American Union; American Slavery; and the Free Church” (5 March 1846), GES, *Third Annual Report*, p. 60. Quote by Rev. Alexander Harvey.

⁵⁷⁸ *GESMB*, pp. 306-308 (6 January 1852), *GH* “Reform Meeting in the City Hall” (17 May 1859)

⁵⁷⁹ *GESMB*, pp. 306-308 (6 January 1852), pp. 332-333 (28 February 1860), pp. 332-334 (8 March 1860), *GH*, “Arrival of Three American Fugitive Slaves” (3 January 1851), “Anti-Slavery Meeting” (24 January 1851), “Present Crisis of American Slavery” (29 February 1860)

to upper class adherents.⁵⁸⁰ The coinciding Glasgow Female New Association (established a year prior by American black Presbyterian Dr. Pennington) seceded from the GFASS in opposition to Garrison's perceived infidelity.⁵⁸¹ Previous writings suggest that Glaswegian abolitionism continued to be dogged by internal fighting amongst various groups; the former claiming GES spent most of the decade criticising the "new" associations.⁵⁸² However, the female group opposing the Garrisonians began attacking AASS back in 1850, along with other staunch British evangelicals, namely Congressionalist minister, John Angell James, a close associate of Wardlaw. Garrison's continued denunciations of American churches implicated in slavery were interpreted as direct assaults on the Christian religion, resulting in fresh accusations of infidelity. The US pro-slavery interest conveniently labelled abolitionists as infidels and freethinkers in order to disempower and stigmatize them; however, in Britain, certain anti-slavery groups, like the GNASS, perpetuated this belief for their own reasons.⁵⁸³

Through the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, GNFA founder Dr. Pennington held ties to Dr. Wardlaw and his associates. Both new Glasgow abolition societies were staunchly evangelical and abhorred the controversial Scriptural discussions often printed in the *Liberator*. Likewise, they refrained from overtly political commentary. In consequence, they ceased to donate articles to the Boston Anti-Slavery Bazaar run by Maria Weston Chapman, which funded AASS.⁵⁸⁴ One common denominator in the ranks, though, was Rev. John Guthrie of the Evangelical Union. In the early 1850s, Guthrie, who had previously ignored American slavery, suddenly became a stalwart abolitionist; yet, quite publicly lambasted Garrison and AASS for their alleged infidel doctrines and censure of Christianity. Guthrie's distain for Garrison resulted in a very public campaign to discredit AASS's President, involving multiple letters printed in the *Christian News* (EU paper) and an article in the GFNA's *The Friend of the Fugitive*. Whether his reasoning

⁵⁸⁰ Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, pp. 157-158, 179

⁵⁸¹ GH, "Anti-Slavery Meeting—Glasgow Female New Association" (28 January 1853, GFNA, *The Friend of the Fugitive*, and *Anti-Slavery Record* (Glasgow, 1853)

⁵⁸² Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, pp. 197-199, Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, pp. 156-158

⁵⁸³ *Belfast Newsletter*, "American Abolitionist Agitation—Mr. W. L. Garrison and the News Letter" (6 October 1846), Maria W. Chapman, *Paris, June 8th, 1850 To Margaret Smith, Jane Barclay, Elizabeth Turner ... and Mary Muir, of Glasgow* (Dublin, 1850), DC, "The Anti-Slavery Party in the United States" (30 June 1846), reprinted from the *London Daily News*, John B. Estlin, *Reply to a circular issued by the Glasgow Association for the Abolition of Slavery: recommending a discontinuance of British support to the Boston Anti-Slavery Bazaar* (Paris, 1850), Garrison to the Editor of the *London Morning Advertiser* (19 September 1851), in WLG, *Letters*, IV, pp. 71-85, GH, "Anti-Slavery Lecture" (20 August 1852)

⁵⁸⁴ BCLASS, *Statements Respecting the American Abolitionists* (Dublin, 1852), pp. 18-20, Chapman, *Paris, June 8th, 1850*, p. 1, Andrew Paton to Garrison (7 February 1851), William Smeal to W. W. Brown (12 December 1850) in Taylor, *BAA*, pp. 362-363

was strictly religious or not, the controversy earned him an honoured place next to Dr. Wardlaw at the Glasgow public meeting to welcome Harriet Beecher Stowe.⁵⁸⁵

John Guthrie's antipathy coincided with the arrival of US theologians C. G. Finney and A. C. Mahan in late 1849-early 1850. In Glasgow, Finney and Mahan openly criticised the Garrisonians. Guthrie's church, the EU, was initially founded on Finney's "New Measures." Therefore, Finney's rejection of the "infidel" abolitionism of the Old American society validated Guthrie and GFNA's position.⁵⁸⁶ The *Glasgow Chronicle*, antagonistic to the Garrison party, printed a letter by Mahan condemning AASS as an "anti-church and anti-Christian society," stating, "What shall we think of a society which employs men, knowing them to be guilty of such blasphemous outrages upon all that is sacred in religion and the religious sentiment in men?"⁵⁸⁷ Finney and Mahan joined others evangelicals, such as AFASS' Rev. Colver and Lewis Tappan, soliciting for the Christian Anti-Slavery Convention. The conference itself, although upholding many of the same tenants of AASS—no fellowship with slaveholders and rejection of the Fugitive Slave Law—declared American abolitionism, especially that of the Old society, was in the hands of "infidels." Professor Finney, who recruited the Tappan brothers, Charles Stuart and others to anti-slavery, viewed his new crusade to convert the clergy as instrumental to preserving the Republic.⁵⁸⁸

In response to the attacks, GES publicly declared itself in favour of AASS and Garrison. From its inception, GES maintained a catholic approach to its membership, accepting all those in favour of immediate emancipation for the slaves, regardless of their social, political or religious viewpoints. To attack AASS based upon their personal beliefs in other matters was, to the majority of GES, discriminatory. In the past, the Glasgow members did not always agree on issues outwith the society, yet, they consistently, with the exception of 1840-41, championed universal emancipation. They sought consensus, not division, despite their differing backgrounds, faiths and political leanings. And,

⁵⁸⁵ Evangelical Union, *The Worthies of the Evangelical Union* (Glasgow, 1883), pp. 309-315, 325-327, John Guthrie, "No Slavery—No Infidelity," in GFNA, *The Friend of the Fugitive* (1 April 1853)

⁵⁸⁶ BASR, "Christian Anti-Slavery Convention," 6:72 (December, 1851), p. 196, J. F. Maclear, "Lyman Beecher in Britain," *Ohio History*, 85 (Ohio History Society, 1976), pp. 293-305, *Scotsman*, "Professor Finney" (7 November 1849)

⁵⁸⁷ BCLASS, *Special Report* (London, 1852), p. 47

⁵⁸⁸ Barnes, *Anti-Slavery Impulse*, pp. 17-37, BCLASS, *Special Report*, p. 47-49, Bratt, "Religious Anti-Revivalism," p. 94, McKivigan, *War against Proslavery Religion*, pp. 134-135. Carwardine's *Revivalism* (pp. 96-101) discusses Finney's lasting influence on southern Scotland and Glaswegian religion.

although they preferred the more absolutist, unwavering attitude of AASS, they continued to cooperate with AFASS and BFASS.⁵⁸⁹

It is fair to say that residual bitterness did inhibit Glaswegian anti-slavery efforts. Dr. Wardlaw and several of his orthodox clerical associates could not, in good faith, adhere to AASS in opposition to their own spiritual beliefs. Likewise, Drs. King and Wardlaw most certainly loathed the idea of rejoining a society that publicly questioned their anti-slavery principles, as well as permitting the inclusion of Chartists and “infidel” churchmen. In the same vein, conservatives could not possibly support radical plans for disunion, fearing the political and religious demise of the United States, as demonstrated during the Evangelical Alliance and the FCS fiascos—compromises and excuses for slavery to preserve America’s institutions. On the other hand, GES and various local media believed any compromise with the South would perpetuate slavery, whereas dissolution of the union would, in effect, abolish the system. Wardlaw’s address to American Christians concerning slavery, written on behalf of the GNFA, celebrated Anglo-American religious bonds and advocated continued communion. Actions such as these coincided with various biblical and constitutional analogies aimed at justifying the US system of slavery.⁵⁹⁰ In the words of former slave William Wells Brown,

O, kindle not that bigot fire
 ‘Twill bring disunion, fear and pain;
 ‘Twill rouse at last the southerner’s ire
 And burst our starry land in twain.

Theirs is the high, the noble worth
 The very soul of chivalry;
 Rend not our blood-bought land apart,
 For such a thing as slavery.⁵⁹¹

⁵⁸⁹ BCLASS, *Special Report*, p. 18-20. The GFASS’ Public Meeting, 21 January 1851 was attended by several GES committeemen in support of AASS.

⁵⁹⁰ *BFASR*, “Address of the Glasgow Female Association for the Abolition of Slavery,” 6:65 (May, 1851), *BF*, “Opinions of American Ministers on Slavery and the Fugitive Slave Bill,” 6:3 (1 March 1853), *CM*, “American Slavery” (19 August 1852), “The Evangelical Alliance and the Slavery Question” (18 October 1862), *DC*, “Slavery in America (16 May 1849), “Connection of the Religious Bodies in America with Slavery” (19 May 1852), “American Churches and Slavery” (6 July 1853), *GH*, “The Dissolution of the Union Favourable to Extinction of Slavery” (8 February 1862), *North British Review*, “The American Union: its Effect on National Character and Policy,” 36:71 (February, 1862)

⁵⁹¹ These stanzas refer to Northern concerns about disunion but captures similar sentiment aired in British anti-slavery and religious circles. Brown’s songbook version of “The Bigot Fire” quoted in Varon, *Disunion*, pp. 162-163.

Nonetheless, current and former GES members worked together on occasion in favour of emancipation. In response to requests from BFASS, GES's Rev. Anderson, Smeal and James Turner cooperated alongside former antagonists, Robert Kettle, Dr. King and William P. Paton, to secure a memorial to the government against the continuance of the slave trade. Both W. Paton and Smeal presided on the committee appointed to oversee the Glasgow petition.⁵⁹² Paton, a lifelong friend of Wardlaw's, subscribed to GES during its lean years following the debt incurred from the "Send the Money Back" campaign. George Gallie, although no longer an official GES committeeman, continued to donate funds and publish society tracts.⁵⁹³ The publication of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, though, provided a catalyst for old hostilities to re-emerge.

Harriet Beecher Stowe's sentimental novel on slave life renewed abolitionist zeal in Scotland, as well as throughout the UK. According to Smeal, *Uncle Tom's Cabin* effectually reinvigorated a stalling British anti-slavery campaign, commenting, "At no period in our remembrance—certainly not since the abolition of colonial slavery—has the feeling of the country been raised to such a pitch."⁵⁹⁴ Following the highly publicised FCS episode, public support floundered for the next few years, reflecting the historical ebb and flow of British anti-slavery. From early 1847 until January 1851, the Glasgow society eked out subscriptions from its loyal membership base, which provided funding for the circulation of anti-slavery publications, as well as petitions to Parliament, memorials to the British Government, and remonstrances to various other bodies. The committee continued to welcome noteworthy American abolitionists and financially assist former slaves. GES campaigned against the exclusion of coloured persons aboard American vessels en route to Britain and helped organise BFASS's appeal against the resurging slave trade. The society backed free labour produce, supporting missionary George Blyth's crusade against slave products entering British markets that paralleled their concern for Britain's growing reliance on US slave-grown crops, especially cotton. GES had long supported free labour as a means to abolish slavery and the slave trade. BFASS commended John Murray for devising a plan for regulators to inspect foreign produce to vouch safe its free labour origins.⁵⁹⁵

⁵⁹² *BFASR*, "Slave-Trade Treaties" (1 October 1850)

⁵⁹³ GES, *Thirteenth Annual Report*, pp. 9-12. Gallie continued to assist GES up until the Civil War, see GES, *Cash Book* (William Smeal Collection).

⁵⁹⁴ *BF*, "The Anti-Slavery Movement," 10:12 (1 December 1852)

⁵⁹⁵ *BFASR*, "John Murray to the Editor of the Anti-Slavery Reporter" (26 June 1844), p. 131, Garrison to Wright (1 March 1847), in WLG, *Letters*, III, p. 473, GES, *Cash Book*, ----, *Tenth Annual Report*, pp. 4-7, ----, *Thirteenth Annual Report*, pp. 3-4, 9-12, *GESMB*, p. 296 (1 February 1847), pp. 299-300 (9 May 1848), p. 302 (31 February 1850), pp. 303-304 (6 August 1851), p. 305

The Glasgow Emancipation Society capitalised on Stowe's popularity. The book's low-key approach to advocating emancipation, avoiding the troublesome issue of black equality, and its romantic sentimentality, appealed to all social classes. Prior to the Civil War, the authoress sold a million copies of the book and attracted numerous British elites into the now "fashionable" anti-slavery cause.⁵⁹⁶ The "Friends of Emancipation" in Edinburgh came up with the idea of procuring one penny from each reader of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* to donate to Stowe, to be used for anti-slavery purposes in the US. The book alone commanded widespread interest and sympathy for American slaves; therefore, GES joined the "Penny Offering" and agreed with their Edinburgh allies to use the publicity to pass another national remonstrance against US slavery.⁵⁹⁷ According to the *British Friend*, GES's public meeting on 16 November 1852 drew thousands. The *Friendly Remonstrance of the People of Scotland* focused on the close social, cultural and religious ties between the two countries, although questioned Americans constancy in civil and religious liberty—slavery being the glaring inconsistency of the "glorious" Declaration of Independence—

Americans, shall slavery continue?...Will you still forsake the good old paths of your fathers, and act as if you sought to quench the altar-fires of liberty which they enkindled? Will you continue to undo the work of patriots, reformers, philanthropists, and to affiliate with tyrants, traitors, usurpers, and men-stealers?...We love your magnificent country, your noble institutions, your spirit of progress; therefore do we plead with you. We love liberty, our dearest birthright and yours, for which our fathers and your fathers shed their blood,—liberty, the birthright of all; therefore do we plead with you...Your moral influence, your position among nations, and your glory as a people, will be all the more eminent and enduring, if, by one act of magnanimity, you trample these difficulties in the dust...Then shall the Union Flag of Freedom float above a land without a slave!⁵⁹⁸

Edinburgh and GES hoped the National Remonstrance would attract the attention of the American people. The Glasgow society printed one thousand copies, distributing them to ministers of every denomination in the city and the west of Scotland, as well as targeting

(27 September 1851), pp. 305-306 (6 January 1852), *GH*, "Anti-Slavery Meeting" (24 January 1851), pp. 308-309 (8 February 1852), Paton to Garrison (7 February 1851) in Taylor, *BAA*, p. 363
⁵⁹⁶ Rice, *Scots Abolitionists*, pp. 177-181. Some of Stowe's high-profile admirers were Harriet Elizabeth Georgiana; Lord Morpeth, the earl of Carlisle; and the Duchess of Sutherland, signatories of the infamous "Stafford House Address."

⁵⁹⁷ *GESMB*, pp. 309-310 (9 November 1852), pp. 310-312 (16 November 1852), p. 312 (26 November 1852), Henry Wigham to Garrison (17 November 1852) in Taylor, *BAA*, p. 390, *Uncle Tom Penny Offering. Statement of the Committee* (Edinburgh, 1854)

⁵⁹⁸ *BF*, "The Anti-Slavery Movement," 10:12 (1 December 1852), p. 310, *GESMB*, pp. 310-312 (16 November 1852), *To the People of the United States of America, the Friendly Remonstrance of the People of Scotland, on the Subject of Slavery*, reprinted in *BF*, 6:1 (1 January 1853), pp. 21-22

eminent laymen and the upper classes; resulting in signatures from numerous Congregations and significant Penny Offerings. The remonstrance itself was republished in various US media, clerical and lay, demonstrating its international influence. The Washington, D.C. *Union* newspaper, for example, reported 40,000 people signed the address. Committee records for the Penny Offering indicated over £1600 was donated to Mrs. Stowe from Scotland alone, with another £1800 coming from England. The campaign caught media attention within Scotland and, for the next few years, breathed new life into the cause.⁵⁹⁹

Uncle Tom's catapult to national prominence in anti-slavery circles, the media, and the religious community, moreover, provided an unique opportunity for GES antagonists to re-emerge as an alternative abolitionist society, one which shunned all connection with AASS and Garrison. The Glasgow New Anti-Slavery Society allowed former fallen anti-slavery icons, especially Wardlaw, whose moral and religious principles were questioned during the Evangelical Alliance controversy, to resuscitate their public image. It had been over ten years since the former GES committeemen, Drs. King and Wardlaw, along with Mssrs. Kettle and Paton, officially rejoined an abolitionist society. In 1852, when the new men's committee formed, including some FCS clerics, Stowe's book had already sold upwards half a million copies in Britain; its stage version becoming an instant hit, drawing crowds nightly to metropolitan theatres throughout the country.⁶⁰⁰ *Uncle Tom's* evangelical bent and simplistic anti-slavery message further broadened its general appeal. The main character's Christian piety, likewise, made the piece respectable for churchmen to promote.

Amidst the backdrop of Stowe's book, charges against AASS and Garrison persisted. According to Thompson, "Garrison's infidelity is keeping our Scotch friends (and foes) employed."⁶⁰¹ Guthrie, who joined Wardlaw's association, charged the Garrisonians with conducting,

⁵⁹⁹ *American Missionary*, "To the People of the United States of America" (September, 1855), Wilson Amistead, *A Cloud of Witnesses* (London, 1853), p. 65, *BFASR*, "Address to the people of the United States" (1 November 1855), p. 263, David Christy, etc., *Cotton is King* (Augusta, 1860), p. 207, *Evangelical Repository*, "Friendly Remonstrance on Slavery," 14:3 (August, 1855), pp. 167-168, *GESMB*, p. 312 (26 November 1852), pp. 312-313 (15 February 1853), *Washington Union*, "Letter to the Editors of the *Union*" (13 January 1855), *Uncle Tom Penny Offering*, pp. 1-7, *Scotsman*, "Mrs. Beecher Stowe's Visit to Edinburgh" (3 July 1896)

⁶⁰⁰ *GESMB*, pp. 309-310 (26 April 1852), Thompson to Garrison (24 September 1852) in Taylor, *BAA*, p. 388

⁶⁰¹ Thompson to Webb (22 December 1851) in Taylor, *BAA*, p. 384

A crusade at one and the same time against slavery and Bible Christianity; advocate infidel views...it is time for Christian philanthropists, on this side of the water, to pause and consider how far they can contribute such operations, and circulate such publications, without abetting a movement against principles dearer to them than liberty and even life.⁶⁰²

The EU minister also figured prominently at the annual meeting of the GFNA, denouncing the “Land of Pilgrims” as “infested” with the infidel school, linked with abolitionists. Guthrie’s rants were reprinted and praised by the *British Banner*, who welcomed changes in Glaswegian anti-slavery sentiment in opposition to Garrison. The *Glasgow Chronicle*, edited by UPC minister Rev. Michael Thomson, accused Garrison of heading an “Anti-Bible Convention” that rejected revealed religion and was bitterly “hostile” to religious ministers. Thomson believed Garrison and his associates were entitled to their opinions, which were not a basis for rejecting their society; however, suggested British anti-slavery adherents would best serve the emancipation cause in America by countenancing those with “sound, safe and practical” views.⁶⁰³

In many respects, Thomson’s reasoning bore out with the current American political and religious situation; moral issues climaxed during the 1850s. The slavery question divided political groups, especially Democrats, and its evangelical foundations were increasingly viewed as “ultraist” and destructive to the Union, causing Northern academics and reformers to actively oppose abolitionists. Antebellum evangelicals sought consensus, rejecting those perceived as non-evangelicals; nevertheless, between 1840-1860, the slavery question split the major denominations, blurring doctrinal differences—conservatives wanted abolitionism to remain a political issue not to be discussed in the evangelical church. One American commentator noted, “Ultraism, especially the ultraism of modern abolitionism, now happily dying out, and giving place to a healthy progressive and Christian reform...Orthodox Christianity is necessarily at war with them all, and will one day be the death of them.”⁶⁰⁴

⁶⁰² Garrison to the Editor of the London *Morning Chronicle* (19 September 1851), in WLJ, *Letters*, IV, pp. 71-85, GH, “Anti-Slavery Lecture” (20 August 1852), Guthrie, “No Slavery—No Infidelity,” p. 3

⁶⁰³ BCLASS, *Statements Respecting the American Abolitionists*, p. 18, GC, “The Slavery Question in America” (30 January 1856). Thomson’s editorial was later reprinted and circulated around anti-slavery circles in the UK. Garrison’s response to Thomson’s charges were published by Webb, see Garrison to the Editor of the Anti-Slavery Advocate (18 March 1856), in Taylor, *BAA*, pp. 383-388.

⁶⁰⁴ Johnson, “Sectarian Nation,” pp. 14-18, Kelley, *The Transatlantic Persuasion*, pp. 266-275, NYO, “Scoffers and Scandal Mongers” (23 September 1852)

In this respect, Conservative and Garrisonian anti-slavery adherents were keen to avoid any comparisons to “ultra” American reformers, lest it discredit their objectives. The Edinburgh Ladies Emancipation Society, the staunch supporters of AASS, was certainly aware of anti-Garrisonian opinion. Jane Wigham, William Smeal’s sister, believed the controversial biblical writings of H. C. Wright, Parker Pillsbury, and others, printed in the *Liberator*, offended evangelicals, not only causing significant disaffection amongst those formerly supportive of the Old society but lent weight to the already prolific aspersions against American abolitionists. Smeal’s Quaker journal, the *British Friend*, during this period, uncharacteristically downplayed its usual Garrison zeal, omitting direct references to AASS’s President in articles concerning American slavery, although his paper continued to canvass donations for the Boston Anti-Slavery Bazaar. In many ways, Scottish Garrisonians felt the rivalry was impeding the anti-slavery cause and, in contrast to GNASS and GNFA, choose to ignore the controversy, rather than engage it.⁶⁰⁵

Nonetheless, the New Glasgow men’s committee declared itself in opposition to the “infidel” AASS society, promoting itself an effectual alternative to GES’s Garrisonianism; its Christian advocacy as the best means to abolish American slavery. Having Stowe to accept their invitation to visit Scotland was yet another ploy to outwit Smeal’s group. Her visit caused quite a stir, giving the GNASS widespread publicity. During the Glasgow soiree to honour Stowe and her husband, orchestrated by the male and female new associations, platform speakers depreciated Garrison and the American Anti-Slavery Society. The audience, reportedly in the thousands, was markedly from the middle and upper classes. The following day, at a “Working Men’s” gathering for Stowe, though, “to the great surprise and mortification of the managers,” speaker Thomas Brown praised Garrison, which elicited hisses from GNASS men, but prolific applause from the audience. Considering the anti-Garrisonian slant to both proceedings, it not surprisingly GES members failed to attend.⁶⁰⁶

The Glasgow Emancipation Society wanted to avoid a public showdown over the Garrison issue. As in the past, Smeal believed Wardlaw and his associates would eventually

⁶⁰⁵ A. Paton to Garrison (7 February 1851), Jane Wighan to Anne Warren Weston (18 November 1852) in Taylor, *BAA*, pp. 362-363, 391. Between 1852-1860, *BF* articles mostly reported US intelligence reference slavery without particular reference to any abolitionist society.

⁶⁰⁶ Bingham, *Glasgow Emancipation Society*, p. 203, *GH*, “Anti-Slavery Meeting” (28 January 1853), A. Paton to Mary Estlin (20 April 1853), in Taylor, *BAA*, pp. 397-398, George Shepperson, “Harriet Beecher Stowe and Scotland, 1852-3,” in *SHR*, 32:113 (April, 1853), pp. 40-46. The *GH* article reprinted Stowe’s acceptance of Wardlaw’s invitation, dated 14 December 1852. Smeal did attend the Edinburgh Ladies’ soiree for Stowe.

incriminate themselves, exposing their true motives (to oust AASS, in favour of the more moderate AFASS). Smeal felt the “infidelity” storm would eventually pass, although another open disagreement with fellow anti-slavery men would only hinder their efforts against American slavery and discredit GES. The original Glasgow society, as of late, also suffered the death of its great patron and President, Robert Grahame of Whitehill and other dedicated GES members, affecting its local prestige and making it vulnerable to public disapproval.⁶⁰⁷ Fellow English Garrisonians concurred, knowing full well “any address containing Garrison’s name or especial Notice of the Am. A. S. Society would not only have obtained few signatures, but would have opened the flood-gates for a torrent of mischievous invective.” Mary Estlin, daughter of John Estlin—both Garrison supporters—admired Stowe’s neutral course in relation to the two American societies, choosing instead to showcase the virtue of both the Garrisonian and Tappanite camps as “honest, devoted friends of emancipation.”⁶⁰⁸

GES’s position was further bolstered by the publication of the Bristol and Clifton Ladies’ Anti-Slavery Society’s *Statements Respecting the American Abolitionists*, which defended AASS and Garrison. BCLASS, the Bristol *Examiner*, and the London *Morning Advertiser* accused BFASS of taking credit for the popular Evangelical Alliance and FCS campaigns, even though other societies, like GES, were first to expose the controversy. In seceding from the BFASS, the Bristol society blamed the London association for impeding British efforts to combat US slavery; its anti-AASS stance, in favour of the AFASS, causing dissention within abolitionist circles at home, even to the detriment of visiting American fugitive slaves, such as the Crafts, who were associates of Garrison. “In reference to the hue and cry of ‘infidelity’ which has been raised in England as well as the United States against Mr. Garrison,” noted Baptist Rev. George G. Ritchie, “I still continue to regard it, as I have for several years, as a mere trick of his enemies, or rather of the enemies of the anti-slavery cause.” BCLASS likewise denounced GNASS and GNFA for discrediting the Glasgow Emancipation Society, “well-known names of those friends of the slave in Glasgow, who were foremost in the abolition of British Colonial Slavery.”⁶⁰⁹

⁶⁰⁷ *GESMB*, pp. 309-310 (26 April 1852), p. 312 (26 November 1852), Smeal to W. W. Brown (12 December 1850), in Taylor, *BAA*, pp. 358-359. Besides Grahame, GES lost prominent clergymen Rev. Harvey and Dr. Kidston, along with influential laymen Dr. Maxwell, John McLeod, John Murray, Robert Sanderson, and Dr. Watson.

⁶⁰⁸ John B. Estlin to M. W. Chapman (1 December 1852), Mary Estlin to unk recipient (29 April 1853), in Taylor, *BAA*, pp. 391-392, 398-399

⁶⁰⁹ BCLASS, *Statements Respecting the American Abolitionists*, pp. 1-24, 35-37, 48

In the run-up to Civil War, GNASS would surpass GES in fundraising and publicity. BFASS, who temporarily mended bridges with Smeal's colleagues, alienated the old Glasgow society by joining forces with Wardlaw's group, often to promote critical accounts of Garrison. GNASS continued to financially support BFASS and, in return, the society's actions were consistently aired in the national *BFASR*—Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, especially, commanding several pages, extolling the speeches of Drs. King and Wardlaw; while commending the large sums of money collected from its members.⁶¹⁰ Even with the death of Wardlaw in 1854, the society prospered with wealthy patrons, like W. P. Paton, and eminent clergymen. The Doctor may have had one last hurrah with GNASS's *Uncle Tom* success; however, his abolitionist credentials remained tarnished from the EA scandal, his memoirs downplaying his contribution to the American anti-slavery cause. The new society, likewise, was criticised for covering up UPC's decision to extend fellowship to slaveholders in Old Calabar mission churches.⁶¹¹

Behind the scenes the Glaswegian Garrisonians kept vigil. John Pringle Nichol, Chair of Astronomy at the University of Glasgow and Elizabeth Pease's husband, joined GES in 1853, accepting the Presidency in 1859. His son, John Nichol, Professor of English Literature, continued to collaborate with GES following his father's untimely death the following year. The society cooperated with the newly formed Manchester Anti-Slavery Union, including members George Thompson and his son-in-law, Frederick W. Chesson, which singularly supported AASS.⁶¹² The Old society's liberal attitude towards reform and religion, as always, attracted a diverse membership, composed of academics, local politicians, professionals, and ministers from various denominations.⁶¹³ Further American abolitionists, including Rev. Samuel J. May of Syracuse, N.Y., met with GES and their petitions to Parliament were still presented by local MPs and Lord Brougham. The

⁶¹⁰ *BFASR*, "Mrs. H. B. Stowe," 1:5 (May, 1853), pp. 100-104, "Mrs. H. B. Stowe," 1:7 (May, 1853), pp. 148-149, "American Anti-Slavery Society," 1:7 (July, 1853), p. 151, "British Abolitionist Movements," 4:5 (May, 1856), p. 118, "British Abolitionist Movements," 7:6 (June, 1859), p. 144

⁶¹¹ Alexander, *Ralph Wardlaw*, Chapter 12, *BFASR*, "Slavery and the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland," 4:11 (November, 1856), pp. 261-263, *GM*, "Rev. Ralph Wardlaw, D.D." (June, 1854), pp. 653-656, *UPM*, "Memoirs of the Rev. Dr. Wardlaw" (March, 1856), pp. 119-123. Comments concerning Wardlaw's anti-slavery career focused on his early efforts 1823-1838, omitting references to GES divisions. The *ASR* piece reprinted a letter from the *GC* that accused the GNASS's Dr. Robson of falsely vindicating UPC's actions.

⁶¹² *BFASR*, "Manchester Anti-Slavery Conference," 2:9 (September, 1854), pp. 201-216, *GESMB*, pp. 314 (1 September 1853), pp. 315-321 (20 December 1853), pp. 326-328 (10 March 1859)

⁶¹³ Persons associated with GES from 1850-1861 (not inclusive): Ballies William Govan, James Turner; Councilors Edward Alexander, James Moir, James Thomson; Dr. William Young; MPs Walter Buchanan, Alexander Hastie, Robert Dalglish; and Revs. William Anderson (UPC-formerly RC), Harvey W. Crosskey (Unitarian), Fergus Ferguson (CUS), George Jeffrey (UPS-formerly USC), David Johnstone (CUS), Hugh Riddell (EU), William Smeal (Quaker).

committee diligently followed international anti-slavery news, continuing to send appeals and memorials to various Government ministers. Several daughters and wives of GES members consistently advocated AASS by soliciting donations for the Boston Bazaar, outsurpassing their rivals, GNFA, in member participation and, at times, donations. The Glasgow ladies were bolstered by the loyal contributions of ELASS, also wives of prominent Edinburgh men—Dr. Thomas Guthrie, Lord Provost Duncan McLaren, Dr. John Ritchie, and John Wigham.⁶¹⁴

The Civil War in America revived GES's local influence and prestige. Initially the committee remained neutral in respect to the conflict. This was not unusual considering Smeal and other members had long espoused Peace principles. The decision by American abolitionists to support President Lincoln and the North shocked Scottish Garrisonians; yet, GES welcomed General Fremont's proclamation of liberty to the slaves. Speaking at a public meeting on 12 December 1861, the Glasgow society "deplored the existence of Civil War in America," although they hoped that the citizens of the Federal States would see fit to emancipate the slaves, as set forth in the Declaration of Independence.⁶¹⁵ Old British and American hostilities resurfaced during the Trent Affair, significantly influencing anti-slavery sentiment in the Scottish press. Commercial depression in Glasgow, brought on by the conflict, hit the local cotton industry and those employed within it, making advocacy for American slaves difficult. Anti-slavery support in Britain had decreased significantly, eliciting the ire of some US abolitionists. GES was keen to temper their enthusiasm amidst growing discontent with Northern blockades and pro-Confederate claims for liberty. According to one local paper, Glaswegian interests were closely interwoven with Southern cotton and sugar estates; therefore, abolition had no advocate in Glasgow. Indeed this was the case with regards to GNASS, which ceased anti-slavery activity during the war.⁶¹⁶

⁶¹⁴ *BFASR*, "Boston National Annual Anti-Slavery Bazaar," 5:7, 10 (July and October, 1857), "Rochester Anti-Slavery Bazaar," 5:9 (September, 1857), *GESMB*, pp. 326-327 (10 March 1859), pp. 328-329 (10 August 1859), pp. 329-331 (26 August 1859), pp. 335-336 (10 January and 29 April 1861)

⁶¹⁵ Eliza Wigham to Samuel J. May (unknown date, 1861), in Taylor, *BAA*, p. 462, *GESMB*, pp. 336-337 (25 September 1861), p. 337 (7 October 1861), 338-339 (12 December 1861)

⁶¹⁶ *CM*, "Frederick Douglass on Slavery" (17 October 1862), "The British Press and American Slavery" (5 December 1862), *GESMB*, pp. 339-340 (4 March 1862), *GH*, "The Merchants of Glasgow and Slavery" (6 July 1861), "Distressed Handloom Weavers" (12 November 1861), "The American War—The Slavery View of the Question" (12 November 1861). The "Trent," a British mail packet steamer, was stopped by Union forces in November 1861, who seized Confederates diplomats James Mason and John Slidell. Until their release in January 1862, diplomatic and public relations between Lincoln's government and the Britain remained hostile.

Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, though, quickly divided the abolitionists from the less-enthusiastic anti-slavery adherents. The British media, in general, depreciated the President's announcement, seen as another example of Lincoln's tyranny and a "distinct violation of the constitution."⁶¹⁷ On the other hand, the *Caledonian Mercury* praised the declaration, stating,

For the first time, an American President has risen to the conception of universal emancipation without conditions of colour, without involuntary expulsion, and with an effort to compensate all who will suffer under that social change.⁶¹⁸

By early 1863, the Glasgow society publicly supported the Northern States, petitioning Parliament against British citizens furnishing warships and supplying monetary aid to the Confederates. GES committeemen, Rev. Dr. Anderson, Councillor Moir, and Professor J. Nichol (son), had already come forth in support for the Unionists, despite it running counter to the prevailing sentiment of Glaswegian townsmen. In February 1863, Ballie Govan presided over a GES's meeting, which prepared an address to President Lincoln congratulating him upon his emancipation policy. In April 1863, GES organised a large "Great Emancipation Public Meeting" at City Hall, attended by George Thompson and a deputation from the Manchester Union and Emancipation Society; followed by with another sizeable demonstration in October. The "Great Anti-Slavery Meeting" welcomed the beleaguered Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, brother of Stowe, and several Liberal Glaswegian politicians and ministers—Drs. Anderson, G. Jeffrey, R. Jeffrey; Councillors Alexander, Allan, Moir, Millar, Neill; and John McAdam and Smeal—all GES associates. Although audience opinion diverged on the North/South question, the majority approved of GES's abolitionist message. GES's public assemblies gained national recognition, even from the British Government, who, according to Rev. Anderson,

Waited with deep anxiety for the reports of the Glasgow meetings upon the slave question, and were affected deeply by Glasgow petitions and memorials...our Glasgow society was the great fire by which the cause of the abolition of slavery was sustained.⁶¹⁹

⁶¹⁷ *GH*, "President Lincoln's Slavery Proclamation" (25 October 1862), *North British Review*, "Mr. Lincoln's Anti-Slavery Proclamation," reprinted in *GH* (6 December 1862)

⁶¹⁸ *CM*, "President Lincoln and Slavery" (27 December 1862)

⁶¹⁹ *BFASR*, "British Abolitionist Movements," 11:6 (June, 1863), "Monthly Summary" (1 January 1864), *CM*, "A Glasgow Councillor on American Slavery" (16 April 1863), *Daily News*, "Anti-Slavery Demonstration at Glasgow" (7 February 1863), *GESMB*, pp. 342-343 (13 October 1863), pp. 343-344 (7 November 1863), *GH*, "The Rev. Henry Ward Beecher on the American Crisis" (14 October 1863), William A. Knight, *Memoir of John Nichol* (Glasgow, 1896), pp. 108-109. GES

At the end of the Civil War, the Glasgow Emancipation Society welcomed William Lloyd Garrison, “hero” of American abolitionism. AASS’s President was fêted throughout Britain, especially in Scotland amongst his Garrisonian allies. Edinburgh honoured Garrison with the Freedom of the City on 18 July 1867, “in recognition of his long and meritorious exertions to abolish slavery in North America.”⁶²⁰ At Port Glasgow, the Glaswegian Total Abstinence Society commended Garrison with a complimentary address. In Merchants Hall, 20 July, the Scottish Reform League, representing deputations from Dumbarton, Parkhead, Paisley, Pollockshaws, Port Glasgow, Newmilns and other towns, as well as GES members, Councillor Moir and Smeal, eulogised Garrison. The committee viewed Garrison as a Reformist icon for his constant advocacy of popular liberty. As for the war, the League condemned the “governing classes” for supporting the Confederates, who hoped it would destroy American democracy. Glaswegian reformers, especially radicals, drew clear parallels between the plight of US slaves and their own struggles for social and political liberties in Britain—

The friends of Reform and progress had no longer any need to turn away from America with shame and confusion of face, but now pointed to her as “redeemed, regenerated, disenthralled by the genius of universal emancipation.”⁶²¹

GES celebrated Garrison’s achievements with a large public breakfast, attended by several stalwart Glasgow abolitionists and representatives of the Liberty Party, although those anti-Garrison were conspicuously absent. Even in the aftermath of the great American conflict, Garrison was still a contentious figure, dogged once again by conservative papers, such as the *London Times*, for espousing “extreme” views during his forty-odd years fighting slavery. There would be no City of Glasgow honour for him, as long as old antagonist W. P. Paton presided in the Chamber of Commerce. Yet, local press sympathetic to the anti-slavery cause, sided with Garrison, depreciating the “unnecessary controversy” and “unjust comments” directed at him. The *Scotsman* praised Garrison as an “unflinching honest man as he has always shown himself...[who] did not agitate for modifications and compromise.”⁶²² The *Dundee Courier* concurring, stated, “through

was also credited with the seizure of the Confederate screw-steamer the “Pampero” built by Glaswegian shipbuilders.

⁶²⁰ *BFASR*, “Monthly Summary,” 15:8, New Series (15 August 1867), *DC*, “Lloyd Garrison in Edinburgh” (19 July 1867), *GH*, “Presentation of the Freedom of the City of Edinburgh to Mr. Lloyd Garrison” (19 July 1867)

⁶²¹ *GH*, “Address to Mr. Lloyd Garrison from the Reform League” (20 July 1867)

⁶²² *BASR*, “Monthly Summary,” 15:8, New Series (15 August 1867), *Scotsman*, “Editorial—William Lloyd Garrison” (5 July 1867)

sunshine and storm he consistently and persistently advocated the entire abolition of slavery...one of the great moral forces of America.”⁶²³

Under Smeal’s leadership, the Glasgow Emancipation Society remained a staunch adherent of Garrison and the American Anti-Slavery Society. Of the original GES founders, only Anderson and Smeal lived long enough to witness the complete emancipation of US slaves. It was the combination of fervent evangelical zeal and reformist ideology, along with strict abolitionist principles—mirrored in the Old American society—that shaped GES’s agenda and policy over the years and, in consequence, resulted in their ultimate triumph.

We never felt ourselves less in danger of being seduced by courtesy into the use of expressions which savoured of flattery. Noble indeed was the phalanx of coadjutors which ultimately rallied around you in the great moral conflict. But you were *facile princeps* of the enterprise; by your daring defiance, exasperating the foe to madness which proved his ruin...by your rebukes, awakening the torpid conscience of the Church...by your overwhelming the proud heart of America, beating of its liberty, with hot shame that she was dominated and degraded before the world by an obscene, cruel, and blasphemous villany...*then*, you excited our admiration; *now*, you command our reverence.

Dr. William Anderson⁶²⁴

⁶²³ DC, “Lloyd Garrison in Edinburgh” (19 July 1867)

⁶²⁴ GH, Public Breakfast in Honour of Mr. William Lloyd Garrison” (20 July 1867), *Scotsman*, “Mr. William Lloyd Garrison in Glasgow” (20 July 1867), “Facile princeps”—Latin for obvious leader.

Conclusion

In the years following the American Civil War, the Glasgow Emancipation Society continued fighting against human enslavement throughout the world. It had been over thirty years since the fledgling association founded amidst the heyday of the Reform Act of Scotland and the Voluntary movement, attracting staunch social, religious and political reformers. The new society was not a continuation of the old Glasgow Anti-Slavery Society; in fact, it was a definitive break from the antiquated and compromising policies of the past, which had often dogged Scottish and national anti-slavery efforts. Their ethos centered around two fundamental convictions—Christian integrity and resolute abolitionist principles. Unlike previous societies, GES was no longer confined by the paternalistic creeds of their predecessors; their concern for the slave was firmly grounded in their beliefs concerning civil and religious liberty, imbued in the omnipresent rights of man.

The overwhelming reformist attitude of the society similarly lent weight to its conviction that all men were created equal, regardless of their race, religion or social position. The core members, in particular, Murray and Smeal, viewed slaves as equals, not persons in need of Christianizing or civilizing as a precursor to freedom. A significant portion of the society concurrently campaigned to improve the social and political condition of the British labouring classes, leading local and regional complete suffrage movements, while others not only championed operatives as intelligent and rational members of society, they also espoused foreign revolutionaries in their struggles against repressive governments. GES's open-minded, progressive stance was mirrored in their constitution, which welcomed all those supportive of its object, the immediate and total abolition of slavery, without regard to their individual viewpoints on other matters. The crime of slavery and slaveholding affronted their democratic ideals, as well as their religious convictions.

In this sense, GES was not saddled with the inflexible dogmas of more conservative adherents, those evangelicals who adamantly supported gradual liberation, based on economic and prejudicial concerns. Despite Dr. Thomson's endorsement for the immediate emancipation of slaves, regardless of the consequences—*Fiat justitia ruat coelum*, the Scottish anti-slavery community remained divided between gradualism and immediatism. The Scottish Missionary Society believed abolition would harm missionary efforts. Likewise, Thomas Chalmers sanctioned the Apprenticeship Scheme, demanding the civilizing of Negroes through forced labour and Christianity, prior to gaining freedom.

By the 1840s, the Free Church solicited funds from Southern churches and, in general, Scottish Protestants joined forces to preserve an Evangelical Alliance with American churches, in spite of their relationship with slavery. This dichotomy between religious objectives and anti-slavery aims continuously affected abolition in Scotland and throughout Britain.

However, the Glasgow Emancipation Society, with its determined, uncompromising approach to abolition was, like their Garrisonian cohorts, at odds with much of the aristocratic and mercantile elite, government authorities and certain religious bodies in Britain. Their penchant for American democratic ideals, epitomized in the Declaration of Independence, declaring all men were created equal, with inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, alleviated their personal dilemma concerning slavery and the religious question. They looked to the US for acknowledgement and inspiration with regards to their own social and political circumstances, in many ways equating their own struggle for rights with that of the slave. To the core members of GES, those who lasted well beyond the schism of 1840-41, slavery symbolized all that was wrong in modern society, eradicating American slavery, in particular, was fundamental to redressing the injustice.

During those three decades, the Glasgow Emancipation Society led much of the British response to US slavery. Like Edinburgh and Dublin, they focused on the American system well before any similar English anti-slavery society. GES was credited with recruiting George Stephen and Zachary Macaulay of the Agency Anti-slavery Society. During the 1830s, they openly condemned American Christians for their complicity and complacency in regard to slavery. Their appeals to local religious entities resulted in remonstrations from major Scottish Dissenting denominations. The committee exposed the duplicity of several English ministers, who shunned abolitionists while visiting the US, leading to their public censure, not only within their own churches, but also amongst the British anti-slavery community at large. Abolitionists in Britain were quick to follow GES's lead. Rev. George Bourne's *Picture of Slavery in the United States* was republished in Glasgow, with a preface by Church of Scotland minister, Rev. Cunningham. Nationally, Rev. Thomas Price founded *Slavery in America*; a journal dedicated to the US anti-slavery movement, often covering GES measures, more so than other larger, more affluent UK associations.

GES organized the highly popular debates between George Thompson and US Presbyterian Robert J. Breckinridge, which nightly drew thousands and were extensively

covered in American and British media. The Glasgow society also tackled the Texas question three years before the BFASS, dedicating their *Third Annual Report* to exposing Texan motives for extending slave territories and reviving the slave trade, while concurrently supporting Thompson's tour of Britain lecturing on the subject. Despite their voracious activity during this period, with regards to the America, GES also remained at the forefront of the campaign to abolish the West Indian Apprenticeship Scheme.

Although the society split in the early 1840s, GES became politically stronger because it was no longer confined by the inflexible attitude of the conservative religionists. For the first World Anti-Slavery convention, GES organized exceedingly more delegates than EES and HASS, as well as other larger municipal societies; many actively participating throughout the conference, assigned to various committees, involved with debates, and submitting proposals. A few years later, the Glaswegian abolitionists spearheaded the Free Church of Scotland and Evangelical Alliance controversies. Edinburgh initially followed GES's lead, however, they quickly bowed out due to conflicting loyalties within the society. When GES's agitation on the "No Fellowship" issue attracted widespread attention, both at home and in the US, the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society took notice and was compelled to participate.

From 1844-48, GES's parallel campaigns against FCS and EA were frequently reported throughout Britain, in both religious and secular publications. During this period, several Scottish denominations officially declared themselves against holding communion with American ecclesiastical bodies countenancing slavery, which mirrored the Glasgow society's policy. GES's initiative and proactive response to both controversies reinvigorated public interest and sympathy in American slavery, while highlighting British religious apathy and complicity. The publicity generated from the "Send the Money Back" campaign also helped GES launch its "Disunion" policy, seeking to force the South into emancipating their slaves. This policy may not have garnered the same enthusiasm, but it certainly educated the Scottish public on various pro-slavery legislative measures.

In the years prior to Civil War, GES was conspicuously involved in the successful *Uncle Tom Penny Offering*, along with their Edinburgh colleagues, generating a sizable donation almost equal to the English fund. The Glaswegian abolitionists also headed the *Friendly Remonstrance of the People of Scotland*, which was reportedly signed by 40,000 people, representing numerous secular and religious entities, and reprinted in various US publications, clerical and lay. Despite being undermined by the Glasgow New Anti-

Slavery Society, GES still managed to attract thousands to their meetings. When hostilities in America began, the Glasgow society again rose to the forefront of Scottish abolition, whereas GNASS ceased operations. GES gatherings in support of the Union drew local and national attention; the society itself was credited with sustaining the British abolition movement amidst a divisive and lengthy war.

Historians often label GES as yet another “provincial” society, inhibited by perceived regional and Scottish predilections. The Glasgow abolitionists were not insular; as well as being deeply involved in the progression and welfare of foreign countries, reacting to international reform movements, they considered themselves part of a global brotherhood, partaking in numerous philanthropic activities aimed at alleviating the suffering and oppression of people worldwide. The members of the Glasgow Emancipation Society represented a diverse mix of Scottish society, with numerous religious sects, differing vocations, and varied backgrounds; yet they consistently championed the cause of the slave, in line with promoting the moral and social improvement of their fellow man.

Resurrecting the history of the Glasgow Emancipation Society is important on several levels: firstly, it demonstrates that Scottish, especially Glaswegian, abolition for the nineteenth century was not wholly grounded in the evangelical response, when at times religious loyalties conflicted with anti-slavery objectives; secondly, it shows how reformist ideology significantly influenced GES’s actions and policies, which demanded stricter adherence to abolitionist doctrine, based upon the perceived inalienable rights of man; thirdly, it challenges the idea that smaller, regional societies, like GES, were merely bit players in British abolition, when in reality, the Glasgow society often led efforts in Britain against American slavery; and finally, it questions the provincial stereotype, illustrating GES’s commitment to a wider application of social, religious and political liberties, as well as countenancing the diverging beliefs of others.

GES remains an integral part of the social and political landscape of Scottish culture for the nineteenth century. Its influence and appeal was far-reaching not only in Britain, but also in America. For several decades, the Glasgow society sustained public interest in the fight against US slavery, its actions and policies reinforcing much of the British response to American enslavement. The legacy of Glaswegian abolitionism, especially that of GES, is vital to understanding British anti-slavery historiography and its bearing on transatlantic sociopolitical relations for the period.

Bibliography

Manuscripts

Henry Peter Brougham Papers—University College London
Special Collections

Glasgow University Library—GUL
Special Collections

Mitchell Library (Glasgow, Scotland), Special Collections
William Smeal Collection

National Archives of Scotland—NAS (Edinburgh, Scotland)
Burght Muniments
Dalhousie Muniments
Misc Docs/Deposits

National Archives—Kew
Manuscripts and Archives

National Library of Scotland—NLS
Manuscripts and Archives

Primary Sources

AASS, *An appeal to the abolitionists of Great Britain for the American Anti-Slavery Society, September 25, 1840* (New York, 1840)

-----, *Declaration of Sentiments*, Philadelphia Anti-Slavery Convention, dated 4 December 1833 (Boston, 1834)

-----, *First annual report of the American Anti-Slavery Society* (New York, 1834)

-----, *Fourth Annual Report* (New York, 1837)

ABCFM, *Report of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions* (Boston, 1846)

-----, *Report of the Committee on Anti-Slavery Memorials, September 1845* (Boston, 1845)

Adair, James, *Unanswerable arguments against the abolition of the slave trade with a defence of the proprietors of the British sugar colonies* (London, 1790)

Agency Anti-Slavery Society, *Report of the Agency Committee of the Anti-Slavery Society, established in June, 1831* (London, 1832)

-----, *To the Anti-Slavery Associations, and the friends of negro emancipation throughout the United Kingdom*, (London, 1834)

Aird, Andrew, *Glimpses of old Glasgow* (Glasgow, 1894)

Alexander, William L. *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Ralph Wardlaw, D. D.* (Edinburgh, 1856)

Amistead, Wilson, *A Cloud of Witnesses* (London, 1853)

An Address to Christian Ministers of Every Denomination; also to Religious Professors, who in any way connected with West-Indian Slavery (Bristol, 1827)

Anthony, Susan B., Gage, Matilda J., and Stanton, Elizabeth Cady, *History of Woman Suffrage, I* (Rochester, 1887)

Anthropos, *The rights of man, (not Paines,) but the rights of man, in the West Indies* (London, 1824)

Bacon, Leonard, *Slavery Discussed in occasional essays, from 1833 to 1846* (New York, 1846)

Baird, Henry Marten, *The life of the Rev. Robert Baird, D. D.* (New York, 1866)

Baird, Robert, *The progress and prospects of Christianity in the United States of America* (London, 1851)

Bassett, William, *The Society of Friends in the United States: their Views on the Slavery Question, and treatment of people of colour* (Darlington, 1840)

BCLASS, *Special Report of the Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Anti-slavery Society during eighteen months, from January 1851 to June 1852* (London, 1852)

-----, *Statements respecting the American Abolitionists; by their opponents and their friends* (Dublin, 1852)

Beecher, Henry Ward, *American Rebellion* (Manchester, 1864)

BFASS, *American slavery. Address of the committee of the British and foreign anti-slavery society to the moderator, office bearers, and members of the General assembly of the Free Church of Scotland* (London, 1846)

-----, *British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, for the abolition of slavery and the slave trade throughout the world. Address* (London, 1839)

-----, *Proceedings of the General Anti-Slavery Convention, Called by the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society* (London, 1841)

-----, *Proceedings of the General Anti-Slavery Convention, Called by the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society* (London, 1843)

Birney, James G., *Letter to ministers and elders on the sin of holding slaves, and the duty of immediate emancipation* (New York, 1834)

-----, *Letters of James Gillespie Birney, 1831-1857*, ed. Dwight L. Dumond, 2 vols. (Gloucester, MA, 1966)

-----, *The American churches: the bulwarks of American slavery* (London, 1840)

Blair, George, *Biographic and Descriptive Sketches of Glasgow Necropolis* (Glasgow, 1857)

Blanchard, Jonathan, and Rice, Nathan Lewis, *A Debate on Slavery* (Cincinnati, 1846)

BoFASS, *Eleventh Annual Report* (Boston, 1844)

Boswell, James, *A Letter to the People of Scotland on the Present State of the Nation* (Edinburgh, 1783)

-----, *Letters of James Boswell*, ed. Chauncey Brewster Tinker, II (Oxford, 1924)

Bourne, George, *An address to the Presbyterian church, enforcing the duty of excluding all slaveholders from the "Communion of Saints."* (New York, 1833)

-----, *Picture of slavery in the United States of America* (Middletown, 1834)

-----, *Picture of slavery in the United States of America; being a practical illustration of Voluntaryism and Republicanism* (Glasgow, 1835)

-----, *The Book and Slavery Irreconcilable* (Philadelphia, 1816)

Bristed, John, *The resources of the United States of America* (New York, 1818)

British Colonial Slavery, compared with that of Pagan Antiquity (London, 1830)

Brown, James, *Biographical sketches of the Hon. the Lord Provosts of Glasgow, 1833-83* (Glasgow, 1883)

Brown, William Wells, *The American Fugitive in Europe* (Boston, 1855)

-----, *Three Years in Europe* (London, 1852)

Brougham, Henry Peter, *Historical Sketches of Statesmen Who Flourished in The Time of George III: 2nd series* (London, 1839)

-----, "Speech of the Right Hon. Lord Brougham, on the Immediate Emancipation of the Negro Apprentices," in *Speeches of eminent British statesmen during the thirty-nine years' peace* (London, 1855), pp. 83-129

-----, *The life and times of Henry Lord Brougham*, II (Edinburgh, 1871)

Burns, Robert, *Poems, chiefly in the Scottish Dialect*, II (Edinburgh, 1794)

-----, *The Letters of Robert Burns*, ed., J. De Lancey Ferguson, II (Oxford, 1931)

Campbell, John, *Memoirs of David Nasmyth: His Labours and Travels in Great Britain, France, the United States and Canada* (London, 1844)

Chalmers, Thomas, *A Few Thoughts on the Abolition of Colonial Slavery* (Glasgow, 1824)

-----, *A Selection from the Correspondence of the late Thomas Chalmers, D.D., LL.D.* (New York, 1853)

-----. *Essays on Christian Union* (London, 1845)

-----. *On the Evangelical Alliance: its Design, its Difficulties, its Proceedings, and its Prospects, with Practical Suggestions* (Edinburgh, 1846)

Chambers, Robert, *A biographical dictionary of eminent Scotsmen*, II (Glasgow, 1835)

Chapman, Maria Weston, *Paris, June 8th, 1850 To Margaret Smith, Jane Barclay, Elizabeth Turner...and Mary Muir, of Glasgow* (Dublin, 1850)

Christianity versus slavery, or, A Report, Published in the "Glasgow Argus" Newspaper, November 8, 1841 (Dublin, 1841), pp. 9-43

Christy, David, *Pulpit politics* (Cincinnati, 1962)

-----. *Cotton is King* (Augusta, 1860)

Cleland, James, *Statistical Facts Descriptive of the Former and Present State of Glasgow* (Glasgow, 1837)

Cobbett, William, *Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials*, XXIII (London, 1817)

Cockburn, Henry, *Life of Lord Jeffrey*, Second edition (Edinburgh, 1852)

Collins, John A., *Right and wrong among the abolitionists of the United States* (Glasgow, 1841)

CUS, *Address of the Congregational Union in Scotland to Their Fellow Christians in the United States, on the Subject of American Slavery* (New York, 1840)

-----. *Annual Meeting of the Congregational Union of Scotland--Resolutions of Several Associated Bodies on the Subject of American Slavery* (Glasgow, 1836)

Cox, Samuel Hanson, *Interviews: Memorable and Useful* (New York, 1853)

Crito, *Letters of Crito, on the Causes, Objects, and Consequences, of the Present War*, 2nd edition (Edinburgh, 1796)

Cunningham, Allan, ed., *The Songs of Scotland, Ancient and Modern*, II (London, 1825)

Danson, J. T., "On the Existing Connection between American Slavery and the British Cotton Manufacture," *Journal of the Statistical Society of London* 20, 20:1 (May, 1857)

Day, Thomas, *Fragment of an Original Letter on the Slavery of the Negroes* (London, 1785)

Dempster, George, *Letters of George Dempster to Sir Adam Fergusson, 1756-1813* (London, 1934)

Dickson, William, *Letters on Slavery* (London, 1789)

Discussion on American slavery, in Dr. Wardlaw's Chapel, between Mr. George Thompson and the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, of Baltimore, United States, Second Edition (Boston, 1836)

Douglass, Frederick, *The Free Church of Scotland and American Slavery: an address delivered in Dundee Scotland, on January 30, 1846*, reprinted in *Dundee Courier* (3 February 1846)

----- *The Life and Times of Frederick Douglass* (Hartford and London, 1882)

----- *The Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass*, ed. Philip S. Foner (New York, 1950-1955)

----- *My Bondage and My Freedom*, ed. John David Smith, 1855 edition (New York, 2003)

Douglass, Frederick, and Thompson, George, *Constitution of the United States* (London, 1860)

Douglas, Niel, *The African Slave Trade* (Edinburgh, 1792)

Dow, John, *Trial of the Rev. Niel Douglas, before the High Court of Justiciary at Edinburgh on the 26th May 1817, for sedition* (Edinburgh, 1817)

Dumond, Dwight L., ed. *Letters of James Gillespie Birney, 1831-1857*. 2 vols. (New York, 1938)

Duncan, John Morison, *Travels through part of the United States and Canada in 1818 & 1819*, II (Glasgow, 1823)

Edinburgh Anti-Slavery Society, *People of Scotland Beware!!* (Edinburgh, 1847)

Edinburgh Society for the Abolition of the African Slave Trade, *A Short Address to the People of Scotland on the subject of the Slave Trade* (Edinburgh, 1792)

Edwards, Jonathan, *The works of Jonathan Edwards*, ed., Edward Hickman, I (London, 1839)

EES, *A Voice to the United States of America from Metropolis of Scotland; being an Account of Various Meetings held in Edinburgh on the Subject of American Slavery* (Edinburgh, 1836)

----- *First Annual Report* (Edinburgh, 1835)

----- *Letter from the Executive Committee from the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society to the Commissioners of the Free Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1844)

ENASS, *Edinburgh Anti-Slavery Society—Statement* (Edinburgh, 1854)

Erskine, John, *A view of the causes and consequences of the present war with France*, 12th edition (Edinburgh, 1979)

----- *Shall I Go To War With My American Brethren?* (London, 1769)

- Estlin, John B. *Reply to a circular issued by the Glasgow Association for the Abolition of Slavery* (Paris, 1850)
- Evangelical Alliance, *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Conference, London* (London, 1846)
- , *Report of the proceedings of the Conference held at Freemason's Hall London* (London, 1847)
- Evangelical Union, *The Worthies of the Evangelical Union* (Glasgow, 1883)
- Ferguson, Adam, *Institutes of Moral Philosophy* (Edinburgh, 1769)
- Finney, Charles Grandison, *Lectures on the Revivals of Religion* (New York, 1835)
- , *Memoirs of Charles Grandison Finney. Written by himself* (New York, 1876)
- Forsyth, Robert, *The Beauties of Scotland*, III (Edinburgh, 1806)
- Foster, Stephen S., *The Brotherhood of Thieves* (Concord, 1843)
- Garrison, Wendell Phillips, and Garrison, Francis Jackson, *William Lloyd Garrison, 1805-1879: The Story of His Life Told by His Children*. 4 vols. (Boston, 1885-1889)
- Garrison, William Lloyd, *An Appeal to the Friends of Negro Emancipation throughout Great Britain* (August 10, 1833), reprinted in GES, *First Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1835), pp. 9-10
- , *Letters of William Lloyd Garrison*, ed., Walter M. Merrill, 6 vols. (Cambridge, 1973)
- , *No Compromise with Slavery: An Address Delivered in the Broadway Tabernacle, New York, February 14, 1854* (New York, 1854)
- , *Thoughts on African Colonization* (Boston, 1832)
- GES, *Abolition of Negro Apprenticeship Being the Fourth Annual Report of the Glasgow Emancipation Society* (Glasgow, 1838)
- , *Address by the Committee of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, to the Ministers of Religion in particular, and the Friends of Negro Emancipation in general, on American Slavery* (Glasgow, 1836)
- , *Address of the Glasgow Emancipation Society—To the Friends of the Enslaved, in Scotland, England, and Ireland, in behalf of Five Millions yet in Slavery throughout the World* (Glasgow, 1836)
- , *American slavery: speeches at the public meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, 1st August, 1836* (Glasgow, 1836)
- , *Anti-slavery crisis: great public meeting* (Glasgow, 1838)
- , *Britain and America United in the Cause of Universal Freedom Being the Third Annual Report of the Glasgow Emancipation Society* (Glasgow, 1837)

- . *Circular to the Members and Friends of the Glasgow Emancipation Society* (Glasgow, 1839)
- . *Eleventh Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1845)
- . *Fifth Annual Report of the Glasgow Emancipation Society* (Glasgow, 1839)
- . *First Annual Report of the Glasgow Emancipation Society* (Glasgow, 1835)
- . *Free Church Alliance with Manstealers. Send Back the Money* (Glasgow, 1846)
- . *Memorial from the People of Great Britain and Ireland to the People of the Non-Slave States of America* (Glasgow, 1845)
- . *Mr. J. A. Collins & the Emancipation Committee* (Glasgow, 1841)
- . *Ninth Annual Report of the Glasgow Emancipation Society* (Glasgow, 1843)
- . *Remonstrance of the Members of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, and the Friends of Universal Freedom, with the Citizens of the United States; especially the Members of Christian Churches, on the Subject of Slavery* (Glasgow, 1837)
- . *Report of Discussion on recent disputes in society, &c. Members Meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society* (Glasgow, 1841)
- . *Report of the Speeches, and Reception of the American Delegates, at the Great Public Meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society* (Glasgow, 1840)
- . *Resolutions of Public Meeting of the Members and Friends of the Glasgow Emancipation Society; Correspondence of the Secretaries; and Minutes of the Committee of the said Society, since the arrival in Glasgow, of J. A. Collins, the representative of the American Anti-Slavery Association, in reference to the divisions among American Abolitionists* (Glasgow, 1841)
- . *Second Annual Report of the Glasgow Emancipation Society* (Glasgow, 1836)
- . *Seventh Annual Report of the Glasgow Emancipation Society* (Glasgow, 1841)
- . *Sixth Annual Report of the Glasgow Emancipation Society* (Glasgow, 1840)
- . *Tenth Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1844)
- . *The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and the Rev. Dr. Chalmers, on Christian fellowship with slaveholders: an address* (Glasgow, 1845)
- . *The Free Church and her accusers* (Glasgow, 1846)
- . *Thirteenth Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1851)
- . *To Christian Ministers and Churches of Every Denomination* (Glasgow, 18 October 1844)
- . *Twelfth Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1847)

GFASS, *An Appeal to the Ladies of Great Britain* (Glasgow, 1841)

-----, *First Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1842)

Gilfillan, George, *Life of the Rev. William Anderson* (London, 1873)

Gisborne, Thomas, *Remarks on the late decision of the House of Commons respecting the abolition of the Slave Trade* (London, 1792)

Glasgow Anti-War Society, *Proceedings at the public meeting of the Glasgow Anti-war Society, held in the city hall, 23d April, 1846* (Glasgow, 1846)

Glasgow Ladies Auxiliary Emancipation Society, *Three Years' Female Anti-Slavery Effort, in Britain and America* (Glasgow, 1837)

Glasgow Peace Society, *Address of the Glasgow Peace Society* (Glasgow, 1819)

Glasgow Society for the Abolition of the African Slave Trade, *Address to the inhabitants of Glasgow, Paisley, and the neighbourhood, concerning the African Slave Trade, by a Society in Glasgow* (Glasgow, 1791)

Glasgow Society for the Promotion of the Revival of Religion, *Union of Prayer* (Glasgow, 1830)

Glasgow Voluntary Church Society, *Lectures on Church Establishments* (Glasgow, 1835)

Goodell, William, *Come-Outerism: The Duty of Secession From a Corrupt Church* (New York, 1845)

-----, *Slavery and anti-slavery* (New York, 1855)

Grahame, James, "Africa Delivered; or, The Slave Trade Abolished," in *Poems on the abolition of the Slave Trade* (London, 1809), pp. 55-100

-----, *The history of the United States of North America* (Boston, 1845)

Great Britain House of Commons, *An Authentic Report of the Debate in the House of Commons, June the 23d, 1825, on Mr. Buxton's Motion, II* (London, 1825)

Green, John Patterson, *Fact stranger than fiction* (Cleveland, 1920)

Green, Joseph Joshua, *The Annual Monitor for 1878, or Obituary of the Members of the Society of Friends in Great Britain and Ireland for the Year 1877* (London, 1878)

Grey, Charles, *A national Church vindicated* (London, 1835)

Grimke, Archibald H., *William Lloyd Garrison* (New York, 1891)

Guthrie, John, "No Slavery—No Infidelity," in GFNA, *The Friend of the Fugitive* (1 April 1853)

Hammond, James H., *Letter of His Excellency Governor Hammond, to the Free Church of Glasgow, on the subject of slavery* (Columbia, 1844)

Hansard, Thomas C., *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd Series, vol. XLIX (London, 1839)

-----. *The Parliamentary Debates: forming a continuation of the work entitled "The Parliamentary History of England, From the Earliest Period to the Year 1803,"* X, XV (London, 1824)

-----. *The Parliamentary Debates from the year 1803 to the Present Time*, II (London, 1812)

Harriott, John, *Struggles through life microform: exemplified in the various travels and adventures in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America* (London, 1807)

HASS, *Proceedings of a crowded meeting of the colored population of Boston: assembled the 15th July, 1846* (Dublin, 1846)

Heyrick, Elizabeth, *Immediate, Not Gradual Abolition* (London, 1824)

-----. *Letters on the necessity of a prompt extinction of British colonial slavery chiefly addressed to the more influential classes* (London, 1826)

Hibernian Negro's Friend Society, *The principles, plans, and objects, of "The Hibernian Negro's Friend Society" contrasted with those of the previously existing "anti-slavery societies"* (Dublin, 1831)

Hinton, John Howard, *Memoir of William Knibb, Missionary in Jamaica*, Second Edition (London, 1849)

Horton, Rt. Hon. R. Wilmot, *First Letter to the Freeholders of the County of York, on Negro Slavery; Being an Inquiry into the Claims of the West Indians for Equitable Compensation*, (London, 1830)

Howell, Thomas Bayly, and Howell, Thomas Jones, *A complete collection of state trials and proceedings for high treason and other crimes and misdemeanors from the earliest period to the year 1783* (London, 1826)

Humphrey, Herman, *Great Britain, France and Belgium: a short tour in 1835* (New York, 1838)

Hutcheson, Francis, *A System of Moral Philosophy*, II (London, 1755)

Jeffrey, George, *The pro-slavery character of the American churches, and the sin of holding Christian communion with them* (Edinburgh, 1847)

Jeremie, John, *A letter to T. Fowell Buxton, Esq. on Negro emancipation and African civilization* (London, 1840)

Knight, William A., *Memoir of John Nichol* (Glasgow, 1896)

London Emancipation Committee, *Proceedings of an Anti-Slavery Meeting, Held at Spafields Chapel* (London, 1859)

Lorimer, John Gordon, *The Past and Present Condition of Religion and Morality in the United States of America—An Argument Not for Voluntary but for Established Churches* (Glasgow, 1833)

Lundy, Benjamin, *The war in Texas; a review of facts and circumstances, showing that this contest is the result of a long premeditated crusade against the government* (Philadelphia, 1836)

Macbeth, James, *No fellowship with slaveholders: a calm review of the debate on slavery, in the Free Assembly of 1846* (Edinburgh, 1846)

----- *The church and the slaveholder: or, light and darkness* (Edinburgh, 1845)

Macaulay, Zachary and Cooper, Thomas, *Negro slavery; or, A view of some of the more prominent features of that state of society, as it exists in the United States of America and in the colonies of the West Indies* (London, 1823)

Macfarlane, John, *Christian old age, as exemplified in the life of the late Rev. William Kidston, D.D.* (Glasgow, 1852)

----- *The Life and Times of George Lawson, D.D.* (Edinburgh, 1862)

Macgill, Hamilton M., *Life of Hugh Heugh, D.D* (Edinburgh, 1852)

Mackenzie, Peter, *An exposure of the spy system pursued in Glasgow, during the years 1816-17-18-19 and 20* (Glasgow, 1833)

----- *Old Reminiscences of Glasgow and the West of Scotland*, 2 vols. (Glasgow, 1890)

----- *Reminiscences of Glasgow and the West of Scotland*, 3 vols. (Glasgow, 1865)

Martineau, Harriet, *The Martyr Age of the United States* (Boston, 1839)

MASS, *Fifth annual report of the board of managers of the Massachusettes Anti-Slavery Society* (Boston, 1837)

----- *Eighteenth annual report, presented to the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, by its Board of Managers, January 23, 1850* (Boston, 1850)

----- *Fifteenth Annual Report* (Boston, 1847)

----- *Fourteenth Annual Report* (Boston, 1846)

----- *Tenth Annual Report* (Boston, 1842)

----- *Thirteenth Annual Report* (Boston, 1845)

----- *Resolutions of the Ninth Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, January 27-28, 1841* (Boston, 1841)

----- *Sixteenth Annual Report* (Boston, 1848)

- Matheson, James, and Reed, Andrew, *A Narrative of the Visit to the American Churches* (London, 1835)
- McAdam, John, *Autobiography of John McAdam (1806-1883)*, ed., Fyfe, Janet (Edinburgh, 1980)
- McGill, Alexander T., *American Slavery* (Philadelphia, 1865)
- Memoirs and portraits of one hundred Glasgow men who have died during the last thirty years* (Glasgow, 1886)
- Millar, Hugh, *Scenes and legends of the North of Scotland*, ed. James Robertson, reprinted edition (Edinburgh, 1994)
- Montgomery, James, *The Theory and Practice of Cotton Spinning*, Second edition (Glasgow, 1833)
- Montgomery, James, "The West Indies, a Poem," in *Poems on the abolition of the Slave Trade* (London 1809), pp. 1-46
- Moore, William, *The addresses for blood and devastation, and the addressers exposed* (London, 1776)
- Morse, Sidney E., *Letter on American slavery: addressed to the editor of the "Edinburgh Witness," 8th July, 1846* (New York, 1847)
- Mott, James, *Three Months in Great Britain* (Philadelphia, 1841)
- Mott, James and Lucretia, *James and Lucretia Mott. Life and letters*, ed., Anna D. Hallowell (Boston, 1884)
- Mott, Lucretia, "Slavery and 'The Woman Question,' Lucretia Mott's diary of her visit to Great Britain to attend the World's Anti-Slavery Convention," ed. Frederick B. Tolles, *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* (London, 1952)
- NEASS, *Proceedings of the New-England anti-slavery convention* (Boston, 1834)
- Nelson, Isaac, *Letter from the Rev. Isaac Nelson, of Belfast, member of the Alliance, to the "Belfast newsletter"* (New York, 1846)
- Nickolls, Robert B., *A letter to the treasurer of the Society instituted for the purpose of effecting the abolition of the slave trade. New edition.* (London, 1788)
- Oliver & Boyd's Edinburgh Almanac* (Edinburgh, 1857)
- Paine, Thomas, *Rights of Man* (New York, 1984)
- , *The Writings of Thomas Paine*, ed. M. D. Conway (New York, 1894)
- Pereira, Moses Gomez, *Circular letter to the corresponding societies* (London, 1796)
- Phillips, Wendell, *Speech of Wendell Phillips, Esq. in Vindication of the Course Pursued by the American Abolitionists* (London, 1853)

Post Office Glasgow Directory for 1863, 1864, XXXVI (Glasgow, 1863)

Prince, Thomas, *An Account of the Revival of Religion in Boston, in the years 1740-1-2-3* (Boston, 1823)

-----, *The Christian History, containing accounts of the revival and propagation of religion in Great Britain and America, for 1743* (Boston, 1744)

Proceedings of a Crowded Meeting of the Colored Population of Boston, Assembled the 15th July, 1846, for the Purpose of Bidding Farewell to William Lloyd Garrison, on His Departure for England (Dublin, 1846)

Proceeding of the First General Peace Convention (London, 1843)

Quincy, Edmund, *An examination of the charges of Mr. John Scoble & Mr. Lewis Tappan against the American Anti-Slavery Society* (Dublin, 1852)

Raynal, Abbè, *The Revolution of America* (Edinburgh, 1782)

Reception of George Thompson in Great Britain (Boston, 1836)

Reid, Robert, *Glasgow, past and present*, 3 vols. (Glasgow, 1851)

Reese, David M., *Humbugs of New York* (New York, 1838)

Report of the Discussion on Civil Establishments of Religion (Belfast, 1837)

Rice, Nathan Lewis, *Lectures on slavery, Chicago* (Chicago, 1860)

-----, *Lectures on slavery, Cincinnati* (Cincinnati, 1845)

Robertson, William, *History of America*, I, Book Three, Fourth edition (London, 1824)

Rogers, G. A., "Edinburgh Society Seventy Years Ago", in *Belgravia*, XXXVII (London, 1879), pp. 423-443

Rogers, Nathaniel Peabody, *A collection from the miscellaneous writings of Nathaniel Peabody Rogers* (Philadelphia, 1849)

Root, David, *The abolition cause eventually triumphant: a sermon, delivered before the Anti-Slavery Society of Haverhill, Mass. Aug. 1836* (Andover, 1836)

Sanford, Daniel K., *Speech of Sir Daniel K. Sandford, at a meeting of electors and inhabitants of Glasgow, in the Trades' Hall* (Glasgow, 1832)

Scottish Temperance Society, *Second Annual Report* (Glasgow, 1831)

Society for the Mitigation and Ultimate Abolition of Negro Slavery, *Substance of the speech delivered at the meeting of the Edinburgh Society for the Abolition of Slavery, on October 19, 1830* (Edinburgh, 1830)

Society for the Promotion of Permanent and Universal Peace, *Sixth Annual Report* (London, 1822)

-----, *Third Annual Report* (London, 1819)

Smith, James McCune, "1860 Chronicle," in *Anglo-African Magazine* (January, 1860), pp. 27-32

-----, "John Murray (of Glasgow) Dated 25 September 1852," in *Autographs for Freedom*, ed. Julia Griffiths and Rochester Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society (Boston, 1853), pp. 62-67

Smith, J. Jay, *A Summer's Jaunt across the Water* (Philadelphia, 1846)

Smith, John, *Our Scottish Clergy* (Edinburgh, 1848)

Somerville, Thomas, *My own life and times: 1741-1814* (Edinburgh, 1861)

Sprague, William Buell, *Lectures on Revivals of Religion* (Glasgow, 1832)

Spring, Gardiner, *The Obligations of the World to the Bible* (New York, 1839)

SSPCK, "Proceedings of the Society, in America, under the first patent," *An account of the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge, from its commencement, in 1709*. (Edinburgh, 1774)

Stanton, Henry B., *Sketches of Reforms and Reformers* (New York, 1849)

Stephen, George, *Anti-Slavery Recollections in a Series of Letters Addressed to Mrs. Beecher Stowe* (London, 1854)

Stephen, George, and Scoble, John, *Address to the Anti-Slavery Associations, and the Friends of Negro Emancipation throughout the United Kingdom* (London, 1835)

Stephen, James, *England Enslaved* (London, 1826)

-----, *The History of Toussaint Louverture*, reprinted edition (London, 1814)

-----, *The Memoirs of James Stephen* (London, 1854)

Strang, John, *Glasgow and its Clubs* (Glasgow, 1864)

Tappan, Lewis, "Correspondence of Lewis Tappan and Others with the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society [Part 1]," *Journal of Negro History*, 12:2 (April, 1927), pp. 179-204

-----, *Reply to charges brought against the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society* (London, 1852)

The American almanac and repository of useful knowledge for the year 1855, XXVI (Boston, 1855)

The "Christian Witness" examined on a defamatory charge of infidelity against William Lloyd Garrison, Esq. President of the American Anti-Slavery Society (London, 1847)

The British Temperance League (Edinburgh, 1847)

Thelwall, Algernon S., ed., *Proceedings of the Anti-Maynooth Conference of 1845* (London, 1845)

The Proceedings of the World Temperance Convention (London, 1846)

Thom, William, *Achan's trespass in the accursed thing considered* (Glasgow, 1778)

Thomson, Andrew, *Slavery not Sanctioned, but Condemned by Christianity* (London, 1829)

-----*Substance of the Speech Delivered at the Meeting of the Edinburgh Society for the Abolition of Slavery, on October 19, 1830* (Edinburgh, 1830)

Thompson, George, *Discussion on American slavery* (Glasgow, 1836)

-----*. Discussion on American slavery...with notes by Mr. Garrison, Second Edition* (Boston, 1836)

-----*. First of August: Abolition of the apprenticeship* (Edinburgh, 1838)

-----*. Substance of an Address to the ladies of Glasgow and its Vicinity upon the present aspect of the great question of Negro Emancipation* (Glasgow, 1833)

-----*. The Free Church of Scotland and American slavery* (Edinburgh, 1846)

Tilton, Theodore, *The American Board and American Slavery* (Brooklyn, 1860)

Trollope, Frances, *Domestic Manners of the Americans*, 2 vols. (London, 1832)

-----*. Domestic Manners of the Americans*, ed., Smalley, Donald (New York, 1949)

Turnbull, Robert James, *The Crisis, or, Essays on the Asurpations of the Federal Government* (Charleston, 1827)

Turner, James, *Recollections of James Turner, Esq., of Thrushgrove*, ed., J. Smith (Glasgow, 1854)

Tweed, James, *Considerations and remarks on the present state of the trade to Africa* (London, 1771)

Tyler, Bennet, ed., *Memoir of the Life and Character of Rev. Asahel Nettleton, D.D.* (Hartford, 1853)

Uncle Tom Penny Offering. Statement of the Committee (Edinburgh, 1854)

United Associate Synod of the Secession Church, *An address on negro slavery to the Christian Churches in the United States of America* (Edinburgh, 1836)

United States Department of State, *Papers Relating to Foreign Affairs*, 4:2 (Washington, D.C., 1863)

Vermont Anti-Slavery Society, *First annual report of the Vermont Anti-Slavery Society* (Montpelier, 1835)

Wallace, George, *A System of the Principles of the Law of Scotland*, I (Edinburgh, 1760)

Walsh, Robert, *An appeal from the judgements of Great Britain respecting the United States of America* (Philadelphia, 1819)

Wardlaw, Ralph, *A dissertation on the Scriptural authority, nature, and uses, of infant baptism* (Boston, 1832)

-----, *Discourses on the Principle Points of the Socinian Controversy* (Andover, 1815)

-----, *The jubilee: a sermon preached in West George-street Chapel, Glasgow, on Friday, August 1st, 1834, the memorable day of Negro emancipation in the British colonies* (Glasgow, 1834)

-----, *Unitarianism incapable of vindication* (Andover, 1817)

Watson, Jean L., *Life of Andrew Thomson* (Edinburgh, 1882)

Weld, Issac, *Travels through the states of North America*, vol. I (London, 1799)

Whipple, Charles K., and May, Samuel J., *Relation of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to slavery* (Boston, 1861)

Whitelaw, Alexander, ed., *The Popular Encyclopedia* (Glasgow, 1841)

Wilberforce, William, *A letter on the abolition of the slave trade: addressed to the freeholders and other inhabitants of Yorkshire* (London, 1807)

Willis, Michael, *Slavery indefensible* (Glasgow, 1847)

Winterbotham, William, *An historical, geographical, commercial, and philosophical view of the American United States* (London, 1795)

Woods, Leonard, *Letters to Rev. Nathaniel W. Taylor, D.D.* (Andover, 1830)

Woodside, David, *The soul of a Scottish church* (Edinburgh, 1917)

Worcester, Samuel M., *Essays on slavery* (Amherst, MA, 1826)

Wright, Henry Clarke, *American slavery proved to be theft and robbery* (Edinburgh, 1845)

-----, *Christian communion with slave-holders, will the Alliance sanction it? : Letters to Rev. John Angell James, and Rev. Ralph Wardlaw, D.D.* (Rochdale, 1846)

-----, *Human Life* (Boston, 1849)

-----, *Manstealers: will the Free Church of Scotland hold Christian fellowship with them?* (Glasgow, 1845)

-----, *The Dissolution of the American Union, demanded by justice and humanity, as the incurable enemy of liberty* (Glasgow, 1845)

Secondary Sources

Abel, Annie Heloise, and Klingberg, Frank J., *A Side-Light on Anglo-American Relations, 1839-1858* (Lancaster, 1927)

Anstey, Roger, "The Pattern of British Abolitionism in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries," in *Anti-Slavery, Religion, and Reform*, eds. Seymour Drescher and Christine Bolt (Folkestone, 1980)

Balmer, Randall Herbert, *Encyclopedia of Evangelism* (Louisville, 2002)

Barnes, Gilbert H., *The Anti-Slavery Impulse 1830-1844* (New York, 1933)

Blackett, R. J. M., *Building an Antislavery Wall: Black Americans in the Atlantic Abolitionist Movement, 1830-1860* (Ithaca, 1983)

Bolt, Christine, and Drescher, Seymour, eds., *Anti-Slavery, Religion, and Reform: Essays in Memory of Roger Anstey* (Folkestone, 1980)

Bratt, James D. "Religious Anti-Revivalism in Antebellum America", *Journal of the Early Republic*, 24:1 (Spring, 2004), pp. 65-105

Brown, Stewart J., "The Ten Years' Conflict and the Disruption of 1843", in *Scotland in the age of the Disruption*, eds., Fry and Stewart (Edinburgh, 1993), pp. vii-27

Budney, Stephen P., *William Jay: Abolitionist and Anticolonialist* (Westport, 2005)

Bulloch, James, and Drummond, Andrew L., *The Scottish Church, 1688-1843, the Age of the Moderates* (Edinburgh, 1973)

Burton, Paul F., *A social history of Quakers in Scotland, 1800-2000* (Lewiston, 2007)

Cameron, Nigel M. de S., ed., *Dictionary of Scottish Church History & Theology* (Edinburgh, 1993)

Carwardine, Richard, *Transatlantic Revivalism* (Milton Keynes, 1978)

Clark, Christopher, *The communitarian moment: the radical challenge of the Northampton Association* (Ithaca, 1995)

Clive, John, *Scotch Reviewers: The Edinburgh Review* (Harvard, 1957)

Conforti, Joseph, *Jonathan Edwards, Religious Tradition & American Culture* (Chapel Hill, 1995)

Crawford, Michael J., "New England and the Scottish Religious Revivals of 1742", *American Presbyterians*, 69:1 (Spring 1991), pp. 23-32

Davis, David Brion, "James Cropper and the British Anti-Slavery Movement, 1823-1833," *Journal of Negro History*, 46:3 (1961), pp. 154-173.

-----, "New Sidelights on Early Antislavery Radicalism," *William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 28:4 (October, 1971), pp. 585-94.

- . "The Emergence of Immediatism in British and American Antislavery Thought," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 49:2 (September, 1962), pp. 209-30
- . *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770-1823* (Ithaca, 1975)
- . *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture* (Cornell, 1966)
- Devine, T. M., *Exploring the Scottish Past* (East Linton, 1995)
- . "The Colonial Trades and Industrial Investment in Scotland, C. 1700-1815," *The Economic History Review*, 29:1 (February, 1976), pp. 1-13
- . *The Tobacco Lords* (Edinburgh, 1975)
- Donovan, Robert Kent, "The Popular Party of the Church of Scotland and the American Revolution," in *Scotland and the America in the Age of Enlightenment* (Edinburgh, 1990), pp. 81-99
- Drescher, Seymour, *Econocide: British Slavery in the Era of Abolition* (Pittsburgh, 1977)
- . , "Two Variants of Anti-Slavery: Religious Organization and Social Mobilization in Britain and France, 1780-1870," in *Anti-slavery, religion, and reform*, eds. Christine Bolt and Seymour Drescher (Folkstone, 1980), pp. 47-49
- Dumond, Dwight Lowell, *Antislavery Origins of the Civil War in the United States* (Ann Arbor, 1939)
- Eltis, David, *Economic Growth and the Ending of the Transatlantic Slave Trade* (New York, 1987)
- Fagerstrom, Dalphy I., "Scottish Opinion of the American Revolution", *William and Mary Quarterly*, XI (April, 1954), pp. 252-275
- Fladeland, Betty, *Abolitionists and Working-Class Problems in the Age of Industrialization* (Baton Rouge, 1984)
- . "'Our Cause being One and the Same': Abolitionists and Chartism," in *Slavery and British Slavery, 1776-1846*, ed. James Walvin (Baton Rouge, 1982), pp. 69-99
- . *Men & Brothers. Anglo-American Anti-Slavery Cooperation* (Urbana, 1972)
- Fry, Michael, *Patronage and Principle* (Aberdeen, 1987)
- Fuller, Robert C., *Religious revolutionaries: the rebels who reshaped American religion* (New York, 2004)
- Goodfriend, Joyce, "Scots and Schism: the New York City Presbyterian Church in the 1750s", in *Nation and Province in the First British Empire*, ed. Landsman, pp. 221-244
- Hamilton, Douglas, *Scotland, the Caribbean and the Atlantic World, 1750-1820* (Manchester, 2005)

Hammond, John L., "Revival Religion and Antislavery Politics," *American Sociological Review*, 39:2 (April, 1974), pp. 175-186

Hammond, M. B., "The Cotton Industry. An Essay in American Economic History: Part I. The Cotton Culture and the Cotton Trade," *American Economic Association*, no. 1, New Series (December, 1897), pp. 3-382

Hancock, David, "Scots in the Slave Trade," in *Nation and Providence in the First British Empire*, ed. Ned C. Landsman (Lewisburg, 2001), pp. 60-93

Harris, Bob, "Scotland's Newspapers, the French Revolution and Domestic Radicalism (C. 1789-1794)," *Scottish Historical Review*, 84:217 (April, 2005), pp. 44-47

Harwood, Thomas, "British Evangelical Abolitionism and American Churches in the 1830s," *The Journal of Southern History*, 28:3 (August, 1962), pp. 287-306

Henderson, W. O., *The Lancashire Cotton Famine 1861-1865* (Manchester, 1934)

Hook, Andrew, *Scotland and America* (Glasgow, 1975)

Johnson, Curtis D., "'Sectarian Nation': Religious Diversity in Antebellum America," *OAH Magazine of History*, 22:1 (January, 2008), pp. 14-18

Kelly, Robert L., *The transatlantic persuasion; the Liberal-Democratic mind in the age of Gladstone* (New York, 1969)

Kennon, Donald R., "'An apple of discord': The woman question at the world's anti-slavery convention of 1840," *Slavery & Abolition*, 5:3 (December 1984), pp. 244-247

Kersh, Rogan, *Dreams of a More Perfect Union* (Ithaca, 2001)

Kitching, Paula, Graham, Eric, and Whyte, Iain, *Scotland and the Slave Trade: 2007 Bicentenary of the Abolition of the Slave Trade Act* (Edinburgh, 2007)

Lambert, Frank, *Inventing the "Great Awakening"* (Princeton, 1999)

Landsman, Ned C, ed., *Nation and Providence in the First British Empire: Scotland and the Americas, 1600-1800* (Lewisburg, 2001)

-----, *Scotland and its first American colony, 1683-1765* (Princeton, 1985)

Levesque, George A., "Black Abolitionists in the Age of Jackson: Catalysts in the Radicalization of American Abolitionism," *Journal of Black Studies*, 1:2 (December, 1970), pp. 187-201

Levine, Herbert J., "Union and Disunion in 'Song of Myself,'" *American Literature*, 59:4 (December, 1987), pp. 570-589

Maclear, J. F., "Lyman Beecher in Britain," *Ohio History*, 85 (Ohio History Society, 1976), pp. 293-305

-----, "The Evangelical Alliance and the Antislavery Crusade," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 42:2 (Spring, 1979), pp. 141-64

-----, "The Idea of 'American Protestantism' and British Nonconformity, 1829-1840", *Journal of British Studies*, 21:1 (Autumn, 1981), pp. 68-89

Marshall, Herbert, and Stock, Mildred, *Ira Aldridge: the Negro tragedian* (Southern Illinois, 1968)

Maynard, Douglas H., "The World's Anti-Slavery Convention of 1840," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 47:3 (December, 1960), pp. 452-471

McDaniel, William C., "Repealing Unions: American Abolitionists, Irish Repeal, and the Origins of Garrisonian Disunionism," *Journal of the Early Republic*, 28:2 (Summer, 2008), pp. 243-269

McKivigan, John R., *The War against Proslavery Religion: Abolitionism and the Northern Churches, 1830-1865* (Ithaca, 1984)

Meikle, Henry W., *Scotland and the French Revolution* (London, 1969)

Merrill, Walter M., *Against Wind and Tide: a biography of William Lloyd Garrison* (Harvard, 1963)

Midgley, Clare, *Women against Slavery: The British Campaigns, 1780-1870* (London, 1992)

Noll, Mark A., *America's God, from Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln* (Oxford, 2002)

-----, "Common Sense Traditions and American Evangelical Thought", *American Quarterly*, 37:2 (Summer, 1985), pp. 216-238

-----, "The American Revolution and Protestant Evangelicalism," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 23:3 (Winter, 1993), pp. 620-621

Olmstead, Clifton E., *History of religion in the United States* (Englewood Cliffs, 1960)

Orr, J. Edwin, "Revival and Social Change", *Fides et Historia*, 6:2 (1974), pp. 1-12

Pentland, Gordon, "Scotland and the Creation of a National Reform Movement, 1830-1832", *Historical Journal*, 48:4 (2005), pp. 999-1023

Phillipson, Nicholas T., "Public Opinion and the Union," in *Scotland in the age of improvement*, ed., N. T. Phillipson and Rosalind Mitchison (Edinburgh, 1970)

Pinford, John, ed., *The slave trade debate* (Oxford, 2007)

Peters, Lorraine, "The Impact of the American War on the Local Communities of Southern Scotland," *Civil War History*, IL (June, 2003), pp. 133-152

Price, Jacob M., "The Rise of Glasgow in the Chesapeake Tobacco Trade, 1707-1775," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 11:2 (April, 1954), pp. 179-199

Ragatz, Lowell Joseph, *The Fall of the Planter Class in the British Caribbean, 1763-1833* (New York, 1963)

Rendall, Jane, "‘Friends of Liberty & Virtue’: Women Radicals and Transatlantic Correspondence, 1789-1848", in *Gender and politics in the age of letter-writing*, ed., Caroline Bland and Maire Cross (Aldershot, 2004)

Rice, C. Duncan, "Controversies over Slavery in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Scotland," in *Antislavery Reconsidered : New Perspectives on the Abolitionists*, ed. Lewis Perry and Michael Fellman (Baton Rouge, 1981), pp. 24-48

-----, "The Anti-Slavery Mission of George Thompson to the United States 1834-35," *Journal of American Studies*, 2:1 (April 1968), pp. 13-31

-----, "The Missionary Context of the British Anti-Slavery Movement," in *Slavery and British Society 1776-1846. Problems in Focus Series.*, ed. James Walvin (London, 1982)

-----, *The Scots Abolitionists, 1833-1861* (Baton Rouge, 1981)

Ripley, C. Peter, ed., *The Black Abolitionist Papers—the British Isles, 1830-1865*, I (Chapel Hill, 1985)

Rogers, Alan, "American Democracy: The View from Scotland, 1776-1832," *Albion*, 6:1 (Spring, 1974), pp. 63-71

Sandeen, Ernest R., "The Distinctiveness of American Denominationalism: A Case Study of the 1846 Evangelical Alliance," *Church History*, 45:2 (1976), pp. 222-234

Shepperson, George, "Frederick Douglass and Scotland," *Journal of Negro History*, 38:3 (July, 1953), pp. 307-321

-----, "Harriet Beecher Stowe and Scotland, 1852-3," *SHR*, 32:113 (April, 1953), pp. 40-46

-----, "The Free Church of Scotland and American Slavery," *SHR*, 30:110 (October, 1951), pp. 126-143

-----, "Thomas Chalmers, the Free Church of Scotland, and the South," *Journal of Southern History*, 17:4 (November, 1951), pp. 517-537

-----, "Writings in Scottish-American History: A Brief Survey," *William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 6 (April, 1954), pp. 163-178

Sklar, Kathryn Kish, "Women Who Speak for an Entire Nation": American and British Women Compared at the World Anti-Slavery Convention, London, 1840," *Pacific Historical Review*, 59:4 (November, 1990), pp. 453-499

Stange, Charles D., *British Unitarians against American slavery, 1833-65* (Rutherford, 1984)

Stewart, James Brewer, ed., *William Lloyd Garrison at Two Hundred: History, Legacy, and Memory* (New Haven, 2008)

Sutton, William R., "Benevolent Calvinism and the Moral Government of God: the Influence of Nathaniel W. Taylor on Revivalism in the Second Great Awakening," *Religion & American Culture*, 2:1 (Winter, 1992), pp. 23-47

Swaissland, Charles, "The Aborigines Protection Society, 1837-1909," in *After Slavery: Emancipation and its Discontents*, ed. Howard Temperley (London, 2000), pp. 265-280

Sweet, William W., *Religion in the development of American culture, 1765-1840* (New York, 1952)

Swinfen, D. B., "The American Revolution in the Scottish Press," *New Edinburgh Review* (Edinburgh, 1976), pp. 66-74

Taylor, Clare, *British and American Abolitionists* (Edinburgh, 1974)

Temperley, Howard, *British Antislavery, 1833-1870* (London, 1972)

Thomas, Hugh, *The Slave Trade* (London, 2006)

Turley, David, *The Culture of English Antislavery, 1780-1860* (London, 1991)

Turner, Mary, *Slaves and Missionaries: The Disintegration of Jamaican Slave Society, 1787-1834* (London, 1982)

Varon, Elizabeth R., *Disunion!: the Coming of the American Civil War, 1789-1859* (Chapel Hill, 2008)

Wesley, Charles H., "The Abolition of Negro Apprenticeship in the British Empire," *Journal of Negro History*, 23:2 (April, 1938), pp. 155-59

Wiecek, William M., "Somerset: Lord Mansfield and the Legitimacy of Slavery in the Anglo-American World," *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 42:1 (Chicago, 1974)

Williams, Eric Eustace, *Capitalism and Slavery* (Chapel Hill, 1944)

Whyte, Iain, *Scotland and the Abolition of Black Slavery, 1756-1838* (Edinburgh, 2006)

Journals—Newspapers

Britain

Aberdeen Journal

Abolitionist (British and Foreign Society for the Universal Abolition of Negro Slavery and the Slave Trade)

Anti-Slavery Reporter

Belfast Newsletter

Berrow's Worcester Journal

Blackwood's Magazine

Bradford Observer

British Anti-Slavery Reporter

British Banner

British Emancipator

British Friend (Robert and William Smeal)

Caledonian Mercury

Chartist Circular

Christian News

Congregational Magazine

Daily News

Dundee Courier
Dumfries Standard
Eclectic Review
Edinburgh Review
English Presbyterian Messenger
Essex Standard
Gentleman's Magazine
Glasgow Argus
Glasgow Chronicle
Glasgow Courier
Glasgow Free Press
Glasgow Herald
Herald of Peace
Hogg's Weekly Instructor
Howitt's Journal
Industrial Magazine
Ipswich Journal
Journal of Sacred Literature
Leicester Chronicle
Leeds Mercury
Liverpool Mercury
London Daily News
Manchester Times and Gazette
Medical Times
Millennial Harbinger
Morning Chronicle
Morning Post
Monthly Repository
Newcastle Courant
North British Review
Nroth Star and Leeds General Advertiser
North Wales Chronicle
Patriot
People's Journal
Quarterly Review
Reformers' Gazette
Scotsman
Scots Times
Scottish Christian Journal
Scottish Congregational Magazine
Slavery in America
Tait's Edinburgh Magazine
Temperance Society Record
The Friend of the Fugitive (GFNA)
United Presbyterian Magazine

United States

Abolitionist (NEASS and MASS)
Advocate of Peace
African Repository and Colonial Journal
American Anti-Slavery Reporter
American Missionary
American Presbyterian Review

American Quarterly Register
Colonizationist and Journal of Freedom
Emancipator
Evangelical Repository
Friend of Peace
Journal of the American Temperance Union
Liberator
Literary and Theological Review
New York Observer
North American Review
Quarterly Anti-Slavery Reporter
Panoplist, or, The Christian's armory
Union

Unpublished Theses & Dissertations

Bingham, Robert L., *The Glasgow Emancipation Society, 1833-76* (MLitt, University of Glasgow, 1973)

Botsford, Robert, *Scotland and the American Civil War* (PhD, University of Edinburgh, 1955)

McDaniel, William Caleb, *Our Country is the World: Radical American Abolitionists Abroad* (PhD, John Hopkins University, 2006)

Montgomery, Fiona Ann, *Glasgow Radicalism 1830-1848* (PhD, University of Glasgow, 1974)

Riach, Douglas C., *Ireland and the Campaign against American Slavery, 1830-1860* (PhD, University of Edinburgh, 1976)

Rice, C. Duncan, *The Scottish Factor in the Fight against American Slavery* (PhD, University of Edinburgh, 1969)

Websites

19th Century British Library Newspapers
<http://find.galegroup.com/bncn>

Eighteenth Century Collections Online
<http://find.galegroup.com/ecco>

Google books
<http://books.google.com/>

Internet Archive
<http://www.archive.org/>

JSTOR—19th Century Pamphletes
Cowen Tracts
Hume Tracts
Wilson Anti-Slavery Collection
<http://www.jstor.org>

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography
www.oxforddnb.com

Recovered Histories
Anti-Slavery International
<http://recoveredhistories.org/>

Samuel J. May Anti-Slavery Collection
Cornell University Library-Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections
<http://dlxs.library.cornell.edu/m/mayantislavery/>

Statistical Accounts of Scotland, 1791-1845
<http://stat-acc-scot.edina.ac.uk>